arXiv:1404.2775v1 [math.LO] 10 Apr 2014

QUITE FREE COMPLICATED ABELIAN GROUP, PCF AND BLACK BOXES

SAHARON SHELAH

Abstract. We like to build Abelian groups (or R-modules) which on the one hand are quite free, say $\aleph_{\omega+1}$-free, and on the other hand, are complicated in suitable sense. We choose as our test problem having no non-trivial homomorphism to $\mathbb{Z}$ (known classically for $\aleph_1$-free, recently for $\aleph_n$-free). We succeed to prove the existence of even $\aleph_{\omega_1 \cdot n}$-free ones. We also know other constructions of complicated Abelian groups and modules which are quite free but this is delayed.

This requires building n-dimensional black boxes, which are quite free. Thus combinatorics is of self interest and we believe will be useful also for other purposes.

Date: March 17, 2014.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 03E04, 03E75; Secondary: 20K20, 20K30.

Key words and phrases. cardinal arithmetic, pcf, black box, Abelian groups, λ-free, the TDC, i.e. trivial dual conjecture, trivial endomorphism conjecture, forcing, independence results.

The author thanks the Israel Science Foundation for support of this paper, Grant No. 1053/11. Publication 1028. The author thanks Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing. First typed January 25, 2012.

Anotated Content

§0 Introduction, (labels y,z), pg.3
§(0A) Abelian group and modules, 3
§(0B) Notation, 4

§1 Black Boxes, (labels a), pg.6

[We prove the existence of n-dimensional black boxes as in [Sh:883], which are, e.g. $\aleph_{\omega\cdot n}$-free and even $\aleph_{\omega_1,n}$. It is self contained except some quotation of pcf.]

§2 Building Abelian groups, (label d), pg.18

[So we prove the existence of $\aleph_{\omega_1\cdot n}$-free Abelian group G with no non-trivial homomorphism into $\mathbb{Z}$, (labels d -).]

§3 Forcing, (labels f,g), pg.29

[We prove the consistency of every $\aleph_{\omega_1\cdot\omega}$-free Abelian group $G, \mathrm{Hom}(G,\mathbb{Z}) \neq 0$. Moreover G is a Whitehead group.]

§ 0. Introduction

§ 0(A). **Abelian group and modules.**

We like to determine the supremum of the λ for which we can prove TDC_λ, so, dually, the minimal λ such that consistently we have NTDC_λ which means the failure of TDC_λ, the trivial dual conjecture for λ, where:

(TDC_λ) there is a λ-free Abelian group G such that $\mathrm{Hom}(G,\mathbb{Z}) = 0$.

This seems the weakest algebraic statement of this kind; it is consistent that the number is ∞, as if $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{L}$ then TDC_λ holds for every λ (see, e.g. [GT12]). On the one hand we can by Magidor-Shelah [MgSh:204], for $\lambda = \min\{\lambda$: i.e. λ a fix point, that is $\lambda = \aleph_\lambda\}$ consistently we cannot, that is, NTDC_λ is consistent, as more is proved there: consistently λ-free $\Rightarrow$ free. On the other hand, since long ago we know this for $\lambda = \aleph_1$ and recently by [Sh:883], we know that for $\lambda = \aleph_n$ there are examples using n-BB (n-dimensional black boxes) introduced there (for every n). Subsequently those were used for more complicated algebraic relatives in Göbel-Shelah [GbSh:920], Göbel-Shelah-Strüngman [GbShSm:981] and Göbel-Herden-Shelah [GbHeSh:970]. In [Sh:898] we have several close approximations to proving in ZFC the existence for $\aleph_\omega$, that is $\mathrm{TDC}_{\aleph_\omega}$ using 1-black boxes.

Here we finally fully prove that $\mathrm{TDC}_{\aleph_\omega}$ holds and much more; $\lambda = \aleph_{\omega_1\cdot\omega}$ is the first cardinal for which TDC_λ cannot be proved in ZFC. The existence proof for $\lambda' < \lambda$ is a major result here, relying on existence proof of quite free n-black boxes, (§1) which use results on pcf (see [Sh:1008]). For complementary consistency results we start with the universe forced in [MgSh:204] and then we force with a c.c.c. forcing notion making $\mathrm{MA} + 2^{\aleph_0}$ large but has to work to show the desired result.

Of course, we can get better results (μ^+-free) when $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_\theta$ is so called 1-solvable or $2^\mu = 2^{<\Upsilon} < 2^\Upsilon$ and $\Upsilon < 2^\mu$.

Note a point which complicates our work relative to previous ones: the amount of freeness (i.e. the κ such that we demand κ-free) and the cardinality of the structure are markedly different. In [Sh:898] this point is manifested when we construct say G of cardinality λ which is μ^+-free where $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_0}$ or $\mu \in \mathbf{C}_{\aleph_1}$ and $\lambda = 2^\mu$ or $\min\{\lambda : 2^\lambda > 2^\mu\}$.

An interesting point here is that for many non-structure problems we naturally end up with two incomparable proofs. One is when we have a μ^+-free $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^\partial\mu$ of cardinality λ, λ as above. In this case the amount of freeness is large. In the other, we use the black box from Theorem 1.19. But we may like to use more sophisticated black boxes, say start with $\lambda_\ell, \mu_\ell (\ell \le \mathbf{k})$ black box $\mathbf{x}$ as in Theorem 1.19 and combine it with [Sh:775]. The quotients $G/G_{\delta+1}, \delta$ are close to being $\lambda^+_{\mathbf{k}}$-free, replace free by direct sums of small subgroups.

Recall from [Sh:309, §3]: using BB for models of cardinality κ_1, κ_2 if $\kappa_2 = \kappa_2^{\kappa_1}$ then we can construct ones of cardinality κ_2 such that we get little interaction. This will hopefully help in [Sh:F918], which follows [Sh:897] to use $\partial > \aleph_0$ and here to try to sort out the complicated cases like $\mathrm{End}(G) \cong R$. Maybe can get a neater proof.

In [Sh:54], [Sh:51] we pointed out that combinatorial proofs from [Sh:a, Ch.VIII], [Sh:c, Ch.VIII], should be useful for proving the existence of many non-isomorphic

structures, as well as rigid and indecomposable ones. The most successful case were black boxes applied to Abelian groups and modules first applied in [Sh:172], [Sh:227], that is,

(A) ([Sh:227]) for separable Abelian p-groups G, proving the existence of ones of cardinality $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$ with only so called small endomorphisms;

(B) Let R be a ring whose additive group R^+ is cotorsion-free, i.e. R^+ is reduced and has no subgroups isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ or to the p-adic integers. For $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0} > |R|$ there is an abelian group G of cardinality λ whose endomorphism ring is isomorphic to R and as an R-module it is $\aleph_1$-free.

We can relax the demands on R^+ and may require that G extends a suitable group G_0 such that R is realized by $\mathrm{End}(G)$ modulo a suitable ideal of "small" endomorphisms.

(C) Let R be a ring whose additive group is the completion of a direct sum of copies of the p-adic integers. If $\lambda^{\aleph_0} \geq |R|$ then there exists a separable Abelian p-group G with so called basic subgroup of cardinality λ and $R = \mathrm{End}(G)/\mathrm{End}_s(G)$. As usually we get $\mathrm{End}(G) = \mathrm{End}_s(G) \oplus R$.

On previous history of those algebraic problems see [EM02], [GT12]. Quite many works using black boxes follows, starting with Corner-Göbel [CG85], see again [EM02], [GT12]. On Black boxes in set theory with weak versions of choice see [Sh:1005, §3A] with no choice [Sh:1005, §3B] and for **k**-dimensional maybe see [Sh:F1303].

On further applications of those black boxes continuing the present work, mainly representation of a ring R and the endomorphism ring of a quite free Abelian group, see [Sh:1045].

Discussion 0.1. 1) Note that usually, the known constructions were either for λ-free R-module of cardinality λ using a non-reflecting $S \subseteq S^\lambda_{\aleph_0}$ with diamond or $\aleph_1$-free of some cardinality λ (mainly $\lambda = (\mu^{\aleph_0})^+$ but also in some other cases) many times using a black box (see [Sh:309]) or "the elevator" (see [GT12]). In the former we use induction on $\alpha < \lambda$ and in each α has "one task".

Using black boxes in the nicer version have for each $\delta \in S$ a perfect set of pairwise isomorphic tasks.

The n-dimensional black boxes actually constructed and used were products of black boxes from [Sh:309], each black box separately is only $\aleph_1$-free but the product of k gives $\aleph_k$-freeness. Here things are more complicated.

2) Here cardinality and freeness differ.

3) Note that freeness in [Sh:898] and here are not the same; in [Sh:1006, 4.3=r10] a notation for having both is suggested.

§ 0(B). **Notation.**

Definition 0.2. 1) For a set S of ordinals with no last member let J^{bd}_S be the ideal consisting of the bounded subsets of S.

2) If J_ℓ is an ideal on S_ℓ for $\ell = 1, 2$ then $J_1 \times J_2$ is the ideal of $S_1 \times S_2$ consisting of the $S \subseteq S_1 \times S_2$ such that $\{s_1 \in \delta_1 : \{s_2 \in S_2 : (s_1, s_2) \in S\} \notin J_2\}$ belongs to J_1.

3) If δ_1, δ_2 are limit ordinals, J_ℓ is an ideal on δ_ℓ and $\delta_1 \cdot \delta_2 = \delta_3$ then $J_1 * J_2$ is the following ideal on δ_3: it consisting of $\{\{\delta_1 \cdot i + j : i < \delta_2, j < \delta_1$ and $(i,j) \in A\} : A \in J_1 \times J_2\}$.
4) If δ_1, δ_2 are limit ordinals, J_ℓ is an ideal on δ_ℓ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $\delta_1 \cdot \delta_2 = \delta_3$ then $J_1 \odot J_2$ is the following ideal on δ_3: it consists of $\{\{\delta_1 \cdot i + j : i < \delta_2, j < \delta_1$ and $(j,i) \in A\} : A \in J_2 \times J_1\}$.

Observation 0.3. *If $\partial < \kappa$ are regular then $J^{\rm bd}_\partial \times J^{\rm bd}_\kappa$ is isomorphic to $J^{\rm bd}_\partial * J^{\rm bd}_\kappa$ which is included in $J^{\rm bd}_\partial \odot J^{\rm bd}_\kappa$ which is isomorphic to $J^{\rm bd}_\kappa \times J^{\rm bd}_\partial$.*

Definition 0.4. 1) We say $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^S X$ is (θ, J)-free when[1] J is an ideal of S and for every $\mathscr{F}' \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ of cardinality $< \theta$ there is $\langle w_\eta : \eta \in \mathscr{F}' \rangle$ such that: if $\eta_1 \neq \eta_2 \in \mathscr{F}'$ and $s \in I \backslash w_{\eta_1} \backslash w_{\eta_2}$ then $\eta_1(s) \neq \eta_2(s)$.
2) We say $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^S X$ is $[\theta, J]$-free when each $\eta \in \mathscr{F}$ is one to one and J is an ideal on S and for every $\mathscr{F}' \subseteq \mathscr{F}$ of cardinality $< \theta$ there is a list $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_* \rangle$ of $\mathscr{F}'$ such that: if $\alpha < \alpha_*$ then the set $w_\alpha := \{s \in S : \eta_\alpha(s) \in \{\eta_\beta(s) : \beta < \alpha\}\}$ belongs to J.
3) Let θ-free or (θ)-free mean (θ, J)-free when $S \subseteq {\rm Ord}, J = J^{\rm bd}_S$.
4) We say μ is 1-solvable when μ is singular strong limit and there is a μ^+-free family $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^{{\rm cf}(\mu)}\mu$ of cardinality 2^μ.
5) We say μ is $(\theta, 1)$-solvable when above we weaken "μ^+-free" to "θ-free".
6) We say $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^S X$ is weakly ordinary when each $\eta \in \mathscr{F}$ is a one-to-one function. We say $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^\gamma{\rm Ord}$ is ordinary when each $\eta \in \mathscr{F}$ is an increasing function.

Claim 0.5. *Assume θ is regular, J is an ideal on ∂ extending $[\partial]^{<\gamma}$ and $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^\partial{\rm Ord}$.*
1) Then $\mathscr{F}$ is (θ, J)-free iff $\mathscr{F}$ is $[\theta, J]$-free.
2)? If $\eta \neq \nu \in \mathscr{F} \Rightarrow \theta > \sup\{i : \eta(i) \in {\rm Rang}(\nu)\}$ and every $\eta \in \mathscr{F}$ is one-to-one then we can add in Definition 0.4(2), $\eta_\alpha(s) \notin \{\eta_\beta(t) : \beta < \alpha, t \in S\}$.

Remark 0.6. 1) We may consider only $\eta(i), \emptyset \neq \nu(j)$ in 0.4(1), 1.2(6), 1.6(3).
2) Compare with [Sh:g], [Sh:898].
3) Because of 0.5 the difference between (θ, J)-free and $[\theta, J]$-free is not serious. For **k**-c.p. **x** see Definition 1.4 we use only the later version so do not write $[\theta, J]$.

Proof. Easy or see the proof of 1.11. $\square_{0.5}$

[1] E.g. [Sh:g], this version is used. Sometimes we even demand $\alpha < \alpha_* \Rightarrow \{s \in S : \eta_\alpha(s) \in \{\eta_\beta(t) : \beta < \alpha, t \in I\} \in J$. But in the main case "$J$ is a θ-complete filter on θ", the version in 0.4(1),(2) are equivalent, see 1.11.

§ 1. Black Boxes

We generalized the $\mathbf{k}$-dimensional black box from [Sh:883], where we deal with the special case when $\ell < \mathbf{k} \Rightarrow \partial_\ell = \aleph_0$ because this seems natural for Abelian groups; the black boxes earlier to [Sh:883] where for $\mathbf{k} = 1$.

But here for Abelian groups the most interesting cases are when $\{\partial_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k}\} \subseteq \{\aleph_0, \aleph_1\}$. In the cases we prove existence, the $\mathbf{k}$-dimensional black box is the product of black boxes, i.e. the ones for $\mathbf{k} = 1$.

The main result is Theorem 1.19 telling us that there are $\mathbf{k}$-dimensional black boxes which are quite free.

Convention 1.1. 1) $\bar\partial$ will denote a sequence $\langle \partial_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k}\rangle$ of regular cardinals or just limit ordinals of length $\mathbf{k} \geq 1$ and then $\partial(\ell) = \partial_\ell$ but note that $k = \mathbf{k} - 1$ was used in [Sh:883].
2) Let $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$ denote combinatorial parameters, see below.

Notation 1.2. 0) Here $\bar S = \langle S_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k}\rangle$ and $\bar\partial = \langle \partial_\ell = \partial(\ell) : \ell < \mathbf{k}\rangle$.
1) Let $\bar S^{[\bar\partial]} = \prod\limits_{\ell<\mathbf{k}} {}^{\partial(\ell)}(S_\ell)$ and $\bar S^{[\bar\partial,u]} = \prod\limits_{\ell\in u} {}^{\partial(\ell)}S_\ell$ for $u \subseteq \{0,\dots,\mathbf{k}-1\}$ and if each S_ℓ is a set of ordinals let $\bar S^{<\bar\partial>} = \{\bar\eta \in \bar S^{[\bar\partial]}$: each η_ℓ is increasing$\}$ and similarly $\bar S^{<\bar\partial,u>}$.
2) If $\bar\eta \in \bar S^{[\bar\partial]}, m < \mathbf{k}$ and $i < \partial_m$ then[2] $\bar\eta \restriction (m,i) = \bar\eta \restriction_{\mathbf{x}} (m,i)$ is $\langle \eta'_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k}\rangle$ where η'_ℓ is η_ℓ when $\ell < \mathbf{k} \wedge \ell \neq m$ and is $\eta_\ell \restriction \{i\}$ if $\ell = m$; this is not the same as in[3] [Sh:883]. Also for $w \subseteq \partial_m, \bar\eta \restriction (m, = w)$ is defined as $\langle \eta'_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k}\rangle$ where $\eta'_\ell = \eta_m$ if $\ell < \mathbf{k} \wedge \ell \neq m$ and $\eta'_\ell = \eta_\ell \restriction w$ if $\ell = m$. Let $\bar\eta \restriction (m) = \langle \eta_\ell : \ell \neq m, \ell < \mathbf{k}\rangle$.
3) If $\Lambda \subseteq \bar S^{[\bar\partial]}, m < \mathbf{k}$ and $i < \partial_m$ then $\Lambda \restriction_{\mathbf{x}} (m,i) = \{\bar\eta \restriction (m,i) : \bar\eta \in \Lambda\}$.
4) If $\Lambda \subseteq \bar S^{[\bar\partial]}, m < \mathbf{k}$ and $i \leq \partial_m$ then $\Lambda \restriction_{\mathbf{x}} (m, < i) = \cup\{\Lambda \restriction (m, i_1) : i_1 < i\}$.
5) $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x},\in u} = \cup\{\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \restriction (m,i) : m \in u, i < \partial_m\}$ for $u \subseteq \{0,\dots,\mathbf{k}-1\}$. We may write "$< m$" instead "$\in m$" when "$u = \{0,\dots,m-1\}$" and let $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x},m} = \Lambda_{\mathbf{x},\in\{\ell\}}$.
6) We say $\Lambda \subseteq \bar S^{[\bar\partial]}$ is tree-like <u>when</u> $\bar\eta, \bar\nu \in \Lambda, \bar\eta \restriction (m,i) = \bar\nu \restriction (m,j)$ implies $\eta_m \restriction i = \nu_m \restriction j$ so $i = j$.
7) We say $\Lambda \subseteq \bar S^{<\bar\partial>}$ is normal <u>when</u>: if $\bar\eta, \bar\nu \in \Lambda, m < \mathbf{k}, i, j < \partial_m$ and $\eta_m(i) = \nu_m(j)$ then $i = j$ (hence ν_m is one-to-one; this follows from being tree-like).

We now define in 1.3 the standard $\mathbf{x}$, as it is clearer than the general case (in 1.4) but will not use it as the ZFC-existence results are not standard.

Definition 1.3. 1) We say $\mathbf{x}$ is a standard $\bar\partial$-c.p. (combinatorial $\bar\partial$-parameter) <u>when</u> $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{k}, \bar\partial, \bar S, \Lambda) = (\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar\partial_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar S_{\mathbf{x}}, \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}})$ and it satisfies:

- (a) $\mathbf{k} \in \{1,2,\dots\}$ and let $k = k_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{k} - 1$ (this to fit the notation in [Sh:883])
- (b) $\bar\partial = \langle \partial_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k}\rangle$ is a sequence of regular cardinals; so $\partial_\ell = \partial_{\mathbf{x},\ell}$
- (c) $\bar S = \langle S_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k}\rangle, S_\ell$ a set of ordinals so $S_\ell = S_{\mathbf{x},\ell}$
- (d) $\Lambda \subseteq \bar S^{[\bar\partial]} = \prod\limits_{\ell<\mathbf{k}} {}^{\partial(\ell)}(S_\ell)$, see 1.2(1).

2) If $\ell < \mathbf{k} \Rightarrow \partial_\ell = \partial$ we may write ∂ instead of $\bar\partial$ in $(\mathbf{k}, \bar\partial, \bar S, \Lambda)$ and may say combinatorial $(\partial, \mathbf{k})$-parameter. If $\ell < \mathbf{k} \Rightarrow \partial_\ell = \aleph_0$ we may omit $\bar\partial$ and write "$\mathbf{x}$

[2] It is sometimes natural to replace "$i < \partial_\ell$" by "i a subset of ∂_ℓ from some family $\mathscr{P}_\ell$ and $\eta'_\ell = \eta_\ell \restriction i$ when $\ell = m$", say using $J^{\rm bd}_{\aleph_1} * J^{\rm bd}_{\aleph_1}$ as in [Sh:898]. In [Sh:883] this version was used.

[3] but if we use tree like $\Lambda \subseteq \bar S^{[\bar\partial]}$, see 1.2(6), the difference is small.

is a combinatorial k-parameter. If $\ell < \mathbf{k} \Rightarrow S_\ell = S$ we may write S instead of $\bar{S}$. Also we may write $\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x})$ for $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}$.
3) We say $\mathbf{x}$ (or Λ) is ordinary <u>when</u> (each S_ℓ is a set of ordinals and) $\bar{\eta} \in \Lambda \Rightarrow$ each η_ℓ is increasing. We say $\mathbf{x}$ (or Λ) is weakly ordinary <u>when</u> $\bar{\eta} \in \Lambda \wedge m < \ell g(\bar{\eta}) \Rightarrow \eta_m$ is one-to-one. We say $\mathbf{x}$ is disjoint <u>when</u> $\langle S_{\mathbf{x},m} : m < \mathbf{k}\rangle$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint sets. We say $\mathbf{x}$ is ordinarily full <u>when</u> it is ordinary and $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} = \{\langle \eta_\ell : \ell \leq \mathbf{k}\rangle : \eta_\ell \in {}^{\partial(\ell)}(S_\ell)$ is increasing for $\ell < \mathbf{k}\}$. Similarly for weakly ordinary.
4) We say $\mathbf{y}$ is a permutation of $\mathbf{x}$ <u>when</u> for some permutation π of $\{0, \ldots, \mathbf{k}-1\}$ we have $m < k \Rightarrow \partial_{\mathbf{x},m} = \partial_{\mathbf{y},\pi(m)}$ and $m < k \Rightarrow S_{\mathbf{x},m} = S_{\mathbf{y},\pi(m)}$ and $\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}} = \{\langle \eta_{\pi(m)} : m < \mathbf{k}\rangle : \langle \eta_m : m < \mathbf{k}\rangle \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\}$.
5) We say $\bar{\pi}$ is an isomorphism from $\mathbf{x}$ onto $\mathbf{y}$ <u>when</u>:

- (a) $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}$ call it $\mathbf{k}$
- (b) $\bar{\pi} = \langle \pi_m : m \leq \mathbf{k}\rangle$
- (c) $\pi_{\mathbf{k}}$ is a permutation of $\{0, \ldots, \mathbf{k}-1\}$
- (d) $\partial_{\mathbf{x},m} = \partial_{\mathbf{y},\pi_{\mathbf{k}}(m)}$
- (e) π_m is a one-to-one function from $S_{\mathbf{x},m}$ onto $S_{\mathbf{y},\pi_{\mathbf{k}}(m)}$
- (f) $\langle \nu_m : m < \mathbf{k}\rangle \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{y}}$ <u>iff</u> for some $\langle \eta_m : m < \mathbf{k}\rangle \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ we have $\nu_{\pi(m)} = \langle \pi_m(\eta_m(i)) : i = \partial_{\mathbf{x},m}\rangle$.

6) If $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ then let $\mathbf{x}{\restriction}\Lambda$ be $(\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\partial}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{S}_{\mathbf{x}}, \Lambda)$.

Definition 1.4. 1) We say $\mathbf{x}$ is a $\bar{\partial}$-c.p. (combinatorial $\bar{\partial}$-parameter) <u>when</u> $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{k}, \bar{\partial}, \bar{S}, \Lambda, \bar{J}) = (\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\partial}_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{S}_{\mathbf{x}}, \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{J}_{\mathbf{x}})$ and they satisfy: (in the standard case $J_m = \{w \subseteq \partial_\ell : w$ is bounded$\}$:

- (a) $\bar{\partial} = \langle \partial_m : m < \mathbf{k}\rangle$, a sequence of limit ordinals
- (b) $\bar{J} = \langle J_m : m < \mathbf{k}\rangle$
- (c) J_m is an ideal on ∂_m
- (d) $\bar{S} = \langle S_m : m < \mathbf{k}\rangle, S_m$ a set of ordinals if not said otherwise
- (e) $\Lambda \subseteq \bar{S}^{[\bar{\partial}]}$.

2) We adopt the conventions and definitions in 1.3(2)-(5).

Convention 1.5. 1) If $\mathbf{x}$ is clear from the context we may write $\mathbf{k}$ or $\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}), k$ or $k(\mathbf{x}), S, \Lambda, \bar{J}$ instead of $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}, k_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{S}_{\mathbf{x}}, \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{J}_{\mathbf{x}}$.
2) If not said otherwise $\mathbf{x}$ is weakly ordinary.

Definition 1.6. Assume $\mathbf{x}$ is a $\bar{\partial}$-c.p.
1) We say $\mathbf{x}$ has $(\bar{\chi}, \mathbf{k}, 1)$-Black Box or $\bar{\chi}$-pre-black box <u>when</u> some $\bar{\alpha}$ is a $(\bar{\chi}, \mathbf{k}, 1)$-black box for $\mathbf{x}$ or $(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\chi})$-pre-black box which means:

- (a) $\bar{\chi} = \langle \chi_m : m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$
- (b) $\bar{\alpha} = \langle \bar{\alpha}_{\bar{\eta}} : \bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$
- (c) $\bar{\alpha}_{\bar{\eta}} = \langle \alpha_{\bar{\eta},m,i} : m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}, i < \partial_m\rangle$ and $\alpha_{\bar{\eta},m,n} < \chi_m$
- (d) if $h_m : \Lambda_{\mathbf{x},m} \to \chi_m$ for $m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}$ recalling 1.2(5) <u>then</u> for some $\bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ we have: $m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}} \wedge i < \partial_m \Rightarrow h_m(\bar{\eta} \restriction \langle m, i\rangle) = \alpha_{\bar{\eta},m,i}$.

1A) For $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ we define $\mathbf{x}{\restriction}\Lambda$ naturally.
2) We may write $\bar{\alpha}$ as $\mathbf{b}$, a function with domain $\{(\bar{\eta}, m, i) : \bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}, m < \mathbf{k}, i < \partial_m\}$ such that $\mathbf{b}_\eta(m,i) = \mathbf{b}(\eta, m, i) = \alpha_{\bar{\eta},m,i}$. We may replace $\bar{\chi}$ by χ if $\bar{\chi} = \langle \chi : \ell < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle$ or by $\bar{C} = \langle C_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k} \rangle$ when $|C_\ell| = \chi_\ell$ and demand $\mathrm{Rang}(h_\ell) \subseteq C_\ell$. We may replace $\mathbf{x}$ by $\Lambda = \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ (so say $\bar{\alpha}$ is a $(\Lambda, \bar{\chi})$-pre-black box).
2A) Omitting the "pre" in part (1) means that there is a partition $\langle \Lambda_\alpha : \alpha < |\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}| \rangle$ of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ such that each $\mathbf{x}{\restriction}\Lambda_\alpha$ has $\bar{\chi}$-pre-black box. We may write BB instead of black box.
3) We say "$\mathbf{x}$ is (θ, u)-free over Λ_*" <u>when</u>[4] it is weakly ordinary, $u \subseteq \{0, \dots, \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}} - 1\}$ and for every $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \backslash \Lambda_*$ of cardinality $< \theta$ there is a list $\langle \bar{\eta}_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_* \rangle$ of Λ such that: for every α for some $m \in u$ and $w \in J_m$ we have $\bar{\nu} \in \{\bar{\eta}_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \cup \Lambda_* \wedge \bar{\nu} \restriction (m) = \bar{\eta}_\alpha \restriction (m) \wedge i \in \partial_{\mathbf{x},m} \backslash w \wedge j < \partial_{\mathbf{x},m} \Rightarrow \nu_m(i) \neq \eta_{\alpha,m}(j)$.
3A) If $\theta > |\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}|$ we may (in part (3)) write (∞, u)-free or u-free; we may omit Λ_* if $\Lambda_* = \emptyset$.
3B) If $u = \{0, \dots, \mathbf{k} - 1\}$ we may omit it in (3),(3A) and also in (4).
4) Suppose we are given cardinals $\theta_1 \leq \theta_2$, combinatorial $\bar{\partial}$-parameter $\mathbf{x}$ and Λ_* (usually $\subseteq \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$) and $u \subseteq \{0, \dots, \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}} - 1\}$.

We say $\mathbf{x}$ is $(\theta_2, \theta_1, u, k)$-free over Λ_* <u>when</u>:

- (a) $\theta_2 \geq \theta_1 \geq 1$
- (b) $1 \leq k < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}$, if $k = 1$ we may omit it.
- (c) $u \subseteq \{0, \dots, \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}} - 1\}$ has $\geq k$ members
- (d) for every $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \backslash \Lambda_*$ of cardinality $< \theta_2$ there is a witness $(\bar{\Lambda}, g, \bar{h})$ which means
  - (α) $\bar{\Lambda} = \langle \Lambda_\gamma : \gamma < \gamma(*) \rangle$ is a partition of Λ to sets each of cardinality $< \theta_1$, so $\gamma(*)$ is an ordinal $< \theta_2$
  - (β) $g : \gamma(*) \to [u]^k$; when $k = 1$ we usually use $g' : \gamma(*) \to u$ where $g(\gamma) = \{g'(\gamma)\}$ for $\gamma < \gamma(*)$
  - (γ) $\bar{\eta}, \bar{\nu} \in \Lambda_\gamma \wedge m < \mathbf{k} \wedge m \notin (u \backslash g(\gamma)) \Rightarrow \eta_m = \nu_m$
  - (δ) $\bar{h} = \langle h_m : m \in u \rangle$
  - (ε) $h_m : \Lambda \to J_m$, really just $h_m {\restriction} \{\bar{\eta} \in \Lambda$: if $\gamma < \gamma(*)$ and $\bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_\gamma$ then $m \in g(\gamma)\}$ matters
  - (ζ) if $\bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_\beta$ and $m \in g(\beta)$ and $\bar{\nu} \in \cup\{\Lambda_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\} \cup \Lambda_*$ and $\bar{\nu} \restriction (m) = \bar{\eta} \restriction (m)$ then $i \in \partial_m \backslash h_m(\eta) \Rightarrow \eta_m(i) \neq \nu_m(i)$.

5) In (4) if $\theta_2 > |\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}|$ we may write (∞, θ_1, u, k)-free; we may omit Λ_* if $\Lambda_* = \emptyset$.

Claim 1.7. *Assume $\mathbf{x}$ is a $\bar{\partial}$-c.p. and $u \subseteq \{0, \dots, \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}} - 1\}$.*
1) $\mathbf{x}$ is $(\theta_2, 2, u, 1)$-free iff $\mathbf{x}$ is (θ, u)-free.
2) If $\partial \geq \max\{\partial_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}\}$, $\mathbf{x}$ is (θ, ∂, u)-free and for each $\ell \in u$, $\mathbf{x}$ is $(\partial^+, 2, \{\ell\})$-free <u>then</u> $\mathbf{x}$ is $(\theta, 2, u)$-free.

Proof. Straight. $\square_{1.7}$

Definition 1.8. We say $(\mathbf{x}, \bar{\Lambda})$ witness $\mathrm{BB}^3_{\mathbf{k}}(\lambda, \Theta, \bar{\chi}, \bar{\partial})$ <u>when</u>:

- (a) $\mathbf{x}$ is a $\bar{\partial}$-c.p. with $|\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}| = \lambda$ and $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}$, i.e. $= \ell g(\bar{\partial})$

[4] so if $k_{\mathbf{x}}$ is 1 then $\mathbf{x}$ is $(\theta, \{0\})$-free <u>means</u> $\{\eta : \langle \eta \rangle \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\}$ is $[\theta, J_{\mathbf{x},0}]$-free, not $(\theta, J_{\mathbf{x},0})$-free

(b) $\bar{\Lambda} = \langle \Lambda_{\bar{\nu}} : \bar{\nu} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle$ is a sequence[5] of pairwise disjoint subsets of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$

(c) $\mathbf{x}{\restriction}\Lambda_{\bar{\nu}}$ has $\bar{\chi}$-pre-black box for every $\bar{\nu} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$

(d) if $\theta \in \Theta$ then $\mathbf{x}$ is θ-free respecting $\bar{\Lambda}$ which means that in the list $\langle \bar{\eta}_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_* \rangle$ in Definition 1.6(3), we have $\bar{\eta}_\alpha \in \Lambda_{\bar{\nu}} \Rightarrow \bar{\nu} \in \{\eta_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$

(e) if $(\theta_2, \theta_1) \in \Theta$ then $\mathbf{x}$ is $(\theta_2, \theta_1, \mathbf{k}, 1)$-free respecting $\bar{\Lambda}$, defined similarly.

Remark 1.9. So in 1.8 necessarily we have $\Sigma\{\chi_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k}\} \leq |\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}|$.

Clearly

Claim 1.10. *Assume μ is strong limit $> \mathrm{cf}(\mu) = \partial, \mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^{\partial}\mu$ has cardinality $\lambda = 2^\mu$ and $\mathscr{F}$ is θ-free (i.e. $(\theta, J^{\mathrm{bd}}_\partial)$-free)), moreover, $[\theta, J^{\mathrm{bd}}_\partial]$-free and weakly ordinary, see 0.4(1),(2),(6).*

Then there is a $\langle\partial\rangle$-c.p. $\mathbf{x}$ with $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} = \mathscr{F}$ which is θ-free and has the λ-BB (i.e. $(\langle\lambda\rangle, 1, 1)$-BB).

Proof. The point is that the set of functions from ${}^{\partial >}\mu$ to λ has cardinality $\lambda = |\mathscr{F}|$, see [Sh:898]. $\square_{1.10}$

Claim 1.11. *Assume $\theta_2 \geq \theta_1 = \mathrm{cf}(\theta_1) > \max\{\partial_{\mathbf{x},\ell} : \ell < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}\}$ and $u \subseteq \{0, \ldots, \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}} - 1\}, |u| \geq k \geq 1$, moreover $|u| = k$.*

The following conditions (A),(B),(C) on $\mathbf{x}, \theta_2, \theta_1, u, k$ are equivalent:

(A) $\mathbf{x}$ *is $(\theta_2, \theta_1, u, k)$-free over Λ_**

(B) *as in Definition 1.6(4) omitting clause $(d)(\gamma)$, in this case we call $(\bar{\Lambda}, g, \bar{h})$ an almost witness*

(C) *for every $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \backslash \Lambda_*$ of cardinality $< \theta_2$ there is a weak witness $(g, \bar{h})$ which means: clauses $(\delta), (\varepsilon)$ of 1.6(4)(d) and*

- $(\beta)'$ $g : \Lambda \to [u]^k$
- $(\zeta)'$ *if $\bar{\eta}_1 \in \Lambda$ and $m \in u$ then for all but $< \theta_1$ of the sequences $\bar{\eta}_2 \in \Lambda$ we have*
  - *if $\bar{\eta}_1 \neq \bar{\eta}_2, \bar{\eta}_1 \restriction (m, = \emptyset) = \bar{\eta}_2 \restriction (m, = \emptyset)$ and $m \in g(\beta_1) \cap g(\beta_2)$ and $i \in \partial_\ell \backslash h_m(\bar{\eta}_1) \backslash h_m(\bar{\eta}_2)$ then $\eta_{1,m}(i) \neq \eta_{2,m}(i)$*
- $(\eta)'$ *if $\bar{\eta}_1 \in \Lambda$ and $\bar{\eta}_2 \in \Lambda_*$ then $\bullet$ of $(\zeta)'$ holds.*

Proof. $(A) \Rightarrow (B)$:

Obvious by the formulation of (B).

$(B) \Rightarrow (C)$:

Let $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \backslash \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ have cardinality $< \theta_2$; by clause (B) we can choose $(\bar{\Lambda}, g, \bar{h})$, an almost witness. As $|u| = k$, necessarily g is constantly u, so let $g' : \gamma(*) \to [u]^k$ be constantly u, hence it is enough to prove that $(g', \bar{h})$ is a weak witness. So by the phrasing of (B) and (C) it is enough to prove clauses $(\zeta)', (\eta)'$ of (C). But clause $(\eta)'$ follws froms clause (ζ) of (B), i.e. $(d)(\zeta)$ of Definition 1.6. Now for clause $(\zeta)'$, let $\bar{\Lambda} = \langle \Lambda_\gamma : \gamma < \gamma(*) \rangle$ and assume $\bar{\eta}_\iota \in \Lambda_{\beta_\iota}$ for $\iota = 1, 2$ and $\beta_1 \neq \beta_2 < \gamma(*)$ and $m \in u$ and it suffices to prove $\bullet$ of $(\zeta)'$. Clearly $m \in g'(\beta_1) \cap g'(\beta_2)$. So assuming $\bar{\eta}_1 \restriction (m, = \emptyset) = \bar{\eta}_2 \restriction (m, = \emptyset)$ and $i \in \partial_m \backslash h(\bar{\eta}_1) \backslash h(\bar{\eta}_2)$ we should prove that $\eta_{1,m}(i) \neq \nu_{1,m}(i)$. By the symmetry without loss of generality $\beta_1 < \beta_2$ and

[5] In [Sh:883] we use $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x},<k}$ as index set which if $k = 1$ may have smaller cardinality; so far not a significant difference.

we apply clause (ζ) of (B) with $\bar\eta_1,\bar\eta_2,\beta_1,\beta_2,m$ here standing for $\bar\nu,\bar\eta,\beta,m$ there and get $\eta_{1,m}(i)\neq\eta_{2,m}(i)$ as promised.

$\underline{(C)\Rightarrow(A)}$:

So assume that $\Lambda\subseteq\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\backslash\Lambda_*$ has cardinality $<\theta_2$ and let $(g,\bar h)$ be a weak witness for it; (actually we have no further use of $|\Lambda|<\theta_2$), again g is constantly u. So for $m\in u, i<\partial_m$ and every $\bar\eta\in\Lambda$ let $\Omega^1_{i,m,\bar\eta}=\{\bar\nu\in\Lambda:\bar\nu\restriction(m,=\emptyset)=\bar\eta\restriction(m,\emptyset)$ and $i\in\partial_m\backslash h_m(\bar\nu)$ and $\nu_m(i)=\eta_m(i)\}$.

By the choice of $(g,\bar h)$ and the definition of $\Omega^1_{i,m,\bar\eta}$ we have:

- $\bullet_1$ if $\bar\nu,\bar\rho\in\Omega^1_{i,m,\bar\eta}$ then $\bar\nu\restriction(m,=0)=\bar\rho\restriction(m,=0)$ and $\eta_m(i)=\bar\nu_m(i)$ and $i\in\partial_m\backslash h_m(\bar\nu)\backslash h_m(\bar\rho)$

hence applying clause $(\zeta)'$ of (C) to any $\bar\eta_1\in\Omega_{i,m,\eta}$ we have

- $\bullet_2$ $\Omega^1_{i,m,\bar\eta}$ as $<\theta_1$ members.

Let $\Omega^1_{\bar\eta}=\cup\{\Omega^1_{i,m,\bar\eta}:m\in u,i<\partial_m\}$ so recalling the claim assumption $\theta_1=\mathrm{cf}(\theta_1)>\sum\limits_m\partial_m$

- $\bullet_3$ if $\bar\eta\in\Lambda$ then $\Omega^1_{\bar\eta}$ has cardinality $<\theta_1$.

By transitivity of equality

- $\bullet_4$ if $\bar\nu\in\Omega^1_{\bar\eta}$ then $m<\mathbf{k}\wedge m\notin u\Rightarrow\nu_m=\eta_m$.

For $\bar\eta\in\Lambda$ let $\Omega^2_{\bar\eta}$ be the minimal subset Ω of Λ such that $\bar\eta\in\Omega$ and $\bar\nu\in\Omega\Rightarrow\Omega^1_{\bar\nu}\subseteq\Omega^2_{\bar\eta}$, so recalling θ_1 is regular necessarily $|\Omega^2_{\bar\eta}|<\theta_1$.

Let $\langle\bar\eta^*_\gamma:\gamma<\gamma(*)\rangle$ list Ω. We now choose Λ^1_γ for $\gamma<\gamma(*)$ by $\Lambda^1_\gamma=\cup\{\Omega_{\bar\eta^*_\beta}:\beta\leq\gamma\}$ so $\{\bar\eta^*_\gamma\}\subseteq\Lambda^1_\gamma\subseteq\Lambda$ so clearly $\cup\{\Lambda^1_\gamma:\gamma<\gamma(*)\}=\Lambda$.

Lastly, let $\Lambda^2_\gamma=\Lambda^1_\gamma\backslash\cup\{\Lambda^1_\beta:\beta<\gamma\}$, so obviously $\bar\Lambda^2=\langle\Lambda^2_\gamma:\gamma<\gamma(*)\rangle$ is a partition of Λ. Let $g_*:\gamma(*)\to[u]^k$ be constantly u and $\bar h=\langle h_m:m<\mathbf{k}\rangle$ and we shall show that the triple $(\bar\Lambda^2,g_*,\bar h)$ is as required, so we should check that it is as required in 1.6(4)(d).

Now clauses $(\alpha)-(\varepsilon)$ hold by our choices noting that by $\bullet_4$ we have: if $\bar\eta,\nu\in\Lambda^2_\gamma$ and $m<\mathbf{k},m\notin u$ then $\eta_m=\nu_m$. As for clause (ζ) let $\bar\eta\in\Lambda_\beta,m\in g(\beta),\alpha<\beta$ and $\nu\in\Lambda_\alpha,\bar\nu\restriction(m,=\emptyset)=\bar\eta\restriction(m,=\emptyset)$ and $i\in\partial_m\backslash h_m(\bar\eta)$ and we should prove that $\nu_m(i)\neq\eta_m(i)$. But otherwise $\bar\eta\in\Omega^1_{\bar\nu}\subseteq\Omega^2_{\bar\eta^*_\alpha}\subseteq\cup\{\Lambda^2_{\alpha_1}:\alpha_1\leq\alpha\}$, contradiction. $\square_{1.11}$

Remark 1.12. Why the demand $|u|=k$ in the claim?

Our problem is: in (A) we promise that the function g gives (for a fixed one γ) for all $\bar\eta\in\Lambda_\gamma$ the same u whereas in clause (C) this is not the case, in fact, not well defined. It is natural then to divide Λ_γ to $\leq 2^{\mathbf{k}}$ cases according to the value of g, but then it is not clear that clause (ζ) of (A) holds. To avoid this we assume $|u|=k$.

Definition 1.13. Assume $\ell g(\bar\partial_\iota)=\mathbf{k}_\iota$ and $\mathbf{x}_\iota$ is a combinatorial $\bar\partial_\iota$-parameter for $\iota=1,2,3$ then we say $\mathbf{x}_1\times\mathbf{x}_2=\mathbf{x}_3$ $\underline{\text{when}}$:

- (a) $\bar\partial_3=\bar\partial_1{}^\frown\bar\partial_2$
- (b) $\bar J_{\mathbf{x}_3}=\bar J_{\mathbf{x}_1}{}^\frown\bar J_{\mathbf{x}_2}$

(c) $S_{\mathbf{x}_3,\ell}$ is
- $S_{\mathbf{x}_1,\ell}$ if $\ell < \mathbf{k}_1$
- $S_{\mathbf{x}_2,\ell-\mathbf{k}_1}$ if $\ell \geq \mathbf{k}_1$

(d) $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_3}$ is the set of $\bar\eta \in \prod\limits_{\ell<\mathbf{k}_3} {}^{\partial_3(\ell)}(S_{\mathbf{x}_3,\ell})$ such that for some $\bar\nu \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_1}$ and $\bar\rho \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_2}$ we have:
- if $\ell < \mathbf{k}_1$ <u>then</u> $\eta_\ell = \nu_\ell$
- if $\ell \geq \mathbf{k}_1$ <u>then</u> $\eta_\ell = \rho_{\ell-\mathbf{k}_1}$.

Claim 1.14. *1) If $\mathbf{x}_\iota$ is a combinatorial $\bar\partial_\iota$-parameter for $\iota = 1,2$ <u>then</u> there is one and only one combinatorial parameter $\mathbf{x}_3$ such that $\mathbf{x}_1 \times \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{x}_3$.*
2) The product in Definition 1.13 is associative.
3) If $\mathbf{x}_1 \times \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{x}_3$ then $\mathbf{x}_2 \times \mathbf{x}_1$ is a permutation of $\mathbf{x}_3$, see Definition 1.3(4).
4) If in Definition 1.13, $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2$ are ordinary, see 1.3(3) <u>then</u> so is $\mathbf{x}_3$.

Proof. Straightforward. $\square_{1.14}$

Claim 1.15. *$\mathbf{x}_3$ has $\bar\chi_3$-pre-black box [or $\bar\chi_3$-black box] <u>when</u>:*

(a) *$\mathbf{x}_\iota$ is a combinatorial $\bar\partial_\iota$-parameter for $\iota = 1,2,3$*
(b) *$\mathbf{x}_1 \times \mathbf{x}_2 = \mathbf{x}_3$*
(c) *$\mathbf{x}_\iota$ has $\bar\chi_\iota$-pre-black box [or $\bar\chi_\iota$-black[6] box] for $\iota = 1,2$*
(d) *$\bar\chi_3 = \bar\chi_1{}^\frown\bar\chi_2$*
(e) *if $\ell < \ell g(\bar\partial_2)$ then $\chi_{2,\ell} = (\chi_{2,\ell})^{|\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_1}|}$.*

Proof. We deal with the pre-black box case, the other has essentially the same proof. For each $m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_2}$ let $\bar F^m = \langle F^m_\alpha : \alpha < \chi_{2,m}\rangle$ list $\{F : F$ a function from $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_1}$ into $\chi_{2,m}\}$. By clause (e) of the assumption, recalling 1.9, such sequence exists. Let $\bar\alpha^1$ be a $\bar\chi_1$-black box for $\mathbf{x}_1$ and $\bar\alpha^2$ be a $\bar\chi_2$-pre-black box for $\mathbf{x}_2$.

Lastly, we define $\bar\alpha = \langle \bar\alpha_{\bar\eta} : \bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ where $\bar\alpha_{\bar\eta} = \langle \alpha_{\bar\eta,m,i} : m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_3}, i < \partial_m\rangle$ as follows: for $\bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}, m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_3}$ and $i < \partial_{\mathbf{x}_3,m}$ we let
- if $m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_1}$ then $\alpha_{\bar\eta,m,i} = \alpha^1_{\bar\eta\restriction \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}_1),m,i}$
- if $m = \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_1} + \ell$ and $\ell < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_2}$ then $\alpha_{\bar\eta,m,i} = F^m_{\alpha^2_{\bar\nu,\ell,i}}(\bar\eta\restriction \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_1})$ where $\bar\nu = \bar\eta\restriction[\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_1}, \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}})$, i.e. $\bar\nu = \langle \eta_{\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}_1)+n} : n < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_2}\rangle$.

Clearly $\bar\alpha$ is of the right form, but is it a $\bar\chi^3$-pre-black box? So assume $h_m : \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_3,m} \to \chi_{3,m}$ for $m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_3}$ and we should find $\bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_3}$ as in Definition 1.6. Now first we define $h^2_m : \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_2,m} \to \chi_{2,m}$ for $m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_2}$ as follows: $h^2_m(\bar\nu)$ is the unique $\alpha < \chi_{2,m}$ such that: $\bar\rho \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_1} \Rightarrow h_{\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{x}_1)+m}(\bar\rho{}^\frown\bar\nu) = F^m_\alpha(\rho)$, possible by the choice of $\bar F^m$ above. As $\bar\alpha^2$ is a $\bar\chi_2$-pre-black box, clearly there is $\bar\nu \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_2}$ such that $m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_2} \wedge i < \partial_{\mathbf{x}_2,m} \Rightarrow h^2_m(\bar\nu \restriction (m,i)) = \alpha^2_{\bar\nu\restriction(m,i)}$.

Now for $m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_1}$ we define $h^1_m : \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_1,m} \to \chi_{1,m}$ by $h^1_m(\bar\rho) = h_m(\bar\rho{}^\frown\bar\nu)$ for $\bar\rho \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_1,m}$, it is well defined as our assumption on h_m it has domain $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_3,m}$ and as $\bar\nu \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_2}$, clearly $\bar\rho{}^\frown\bar\nu \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_3,m}$ by the definition of $\mathbf{x}_3$. As $\bar\alpha^1$ is a $\bar\chi_1$-pre-black box for $\mathbf{x}_1$ there is $\bar\rho \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_1}$ such that $m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_1} \wedge i < \partial_{\mathbf{x}_1,m} \Rightarrow h^1_m(\bar\rho) = \alpha^1_{\bar\rho\restriction(m,i),m,i}$. We shall show that $\bar\eta := \bar\rho{}^\frown\bar\nu$ is as required.

First, $\bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_3}$ because $\mathbf{x}_3 = \mathbf{x}_1 \times \mathbf{x}_2, \bar\rho \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_1}$ and $\bar\nu \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_2}$.

[6] really enough if $\mathbf{x}_2$ has a $\bar\chi_2$-black box and $\mathbf{x}_1$ is a $\bar\chi_1$-pre-black box.

Second, if $m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_1} \wedge i < \partial_{\mathbf{x}_3,m} = \partial_{\mathbf{x}_1,m}$ then

(a) $h_m(\bar\eta \restriction (m,i)) = h^1_m(\bar\rho \restriction (m,i))$ by the choices of $\bar\eta$ and h^1_m and
(b) $h^1_m(\bar\rho \restriction (m,i)) = \alpha^1_{\bar\rho,m,i}$ by the choice of $\bar\rho$ and
(c) $\alpha^1_{\bar\rho,m,i} = \alpha_{\bar\eta,m,i}$ by the choice of $\alpha_{\bar\eta,m,i}$ so together $h_m(\bar\eta \restriction (m,i)) = \alpha_{\bar\eta,m,i}$.

Third, if $m \in [\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_1}, \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}) \wedge i < \partial_m$ then $m = \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_1} + \ell, \ell < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}_2}$ and use the choices of $\alpha_{\bar\eta,m,i}$ and of $\bar\nu$. $\square_{1.15}$

The following is similar to [Sh:883], different notation than earlier

Definition 1.16. Let $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{k}, \bar\partial, \bar S, \Lambda, \bar J)$ be disjoint for notational transparency (see 1.3(3)).
0) For $u \subseteq \{0, \dots, \mathbf{k}-1\}$ let $u^\perp = \{\ell < \mathbf{k} : \ell \notin u\}$.
1) For $\mathscr{U} \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{\ell<\mathbf{k}} {}^{\partial(\ell)}(S_{\mathbf{x},\ell})$ let $\Lambda_{\mathscr{U}} = \Lambda_{\mathbf{x},\mathscr{U}} = \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}) = \{\bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} : \eta_\ell \in \mathscr{U}$ for every $\ell < \mathbf{k}\}$.
2) For $\mathscr{U} \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{\ell<\mathbf{k}} {}^{\partial(\ell)}(S_{\mathbf{x},\ell})$ and $u \subseteq \{0, \dots, \mathbf{k}-1\}$ let:

(a) $\mathrm{add}_{\mathbf{x}}(u) = \{\mathbf{u} : \mathbf{u} \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{\ell\in u} {}^{\partial(\ell)}(S_{\mathbf{x},\ell})$ satisfies $|\mathbf{u} \cap {}^{\partial(\ell)}(S_{\mathbf{x},\ell})| = 1$ for $\ell \in u\}$, note that $\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{add}_{\mathbf{x}}(u) \Rightarrow |\mathbf{u}| = |u|$
(b) for $\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{add}_{\mathbf{x}}(u)$ let $\Lambda_{\mathscr{U},\mathbf{u}} = \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u}) := \{\bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$: for some $m \in u$ we have $\ell < \mathbf{k} \wedge \ell \neq m \Rightarrow \eta_\ell \in (\mathscr{U} \cup \mathbf{u}) \cap {}^{\partial(\ell)}(S_{\mathbf{x},\ell})$ and $\ell < \mathbf{k} \wedge \ell = m \Rightarrow \eta_\ell \in \mathscr{U} \cap {}^{\partial(\ell)}(S_{\mathbf{x},\ell})\}$
(c) $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u}) = \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U} \cup \mathbf{u}) \backslash \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u})$; interesting, i.e. non-empty only when $\mathscr{U} \cap \mathbf{u} = \emptyset$ and then equal to $\{\bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$: if $\ell \in u$ then $\eta_\ell \in \mathbf{u}$ and if $\ell \in \mathbf{k} \backslash u$ then $\eta_\ell \in \mathscr{U}\}$.

3) For non-empty $u \subseteq \{0, \dots, \mathbf{k}-1\}$ we say $\mathbf{x}$ is $\theta - (u,k)$-free <u>when</u>: if $\mathscr{U} \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{\ell<\mathbf{k}} {}^{\partial(\ell)}(S_{\mathbf{x},\ell})$ has cardinality $< \theta$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{add}_{\mathbf{x}}(u^\perp)$ is disjoint to $\mathscr{U}$ then $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U} \cup \mathbf{u})$ is $(\infty, 2, u, k)$-free over $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u})$ recalling 1.6(4).
3A) If $\theta > |\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}|$ we may write ∞ instead of θ in part (3).
4) For non-empty $u \subseteq \{0, \dots, \mathbf{k}-1\}$ we say $\mathbf{x}$ is $(\theta_2, \theta_1) - (u,k)$-free <u>when</u> if $\mathscr{U} \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{\ell<\mathbf{k}} {}^{\partial(\ell)}(S_\ell)$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{add}_{\mathbf{x}}(u^\perp)$ disjoint to $\mathscr{U}$ <u>then</u> $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U} \cup \mathbf{u})$ is $(\theta_2, \theta_1, u, k)$-free over $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u})$ recalling 1.6(4).

Observation 1.17. *1) If Definition 1.16(3), the demand is equivalent to $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u}) = \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U} \cup \mathbf{u}) \backslash \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u})$ is $\theta - (u,k)$-free.*
2) Similarly in 1.16(4).
3) If $\mathbf{x}$ is $\theta - (u,k)$-free <u>then</u> $\mathbf{x}$ is (θ, u, k)-free.
4) If $\mathbf{x}$ is $(\theta_2, \theta_1) - (u,k)$-free <u>then</u> $\mathbf{x}$ is $(\theta_2, \theta_1, u, k)$-free.

Proof. 1) As if $\bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U} \cup \mathbf{x}) \backslash \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u})$ and $\bar\nu \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u})$ as $\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{add}_{\mathbf{x}}(u^\perp)$ it follows that $(\exists m \in u^\perp)[\eta_m \neq \nu_m]$.
2),3),4) Straight. $\square_{1.17}$

The Freeness Theorem 1.18. *We have $\mathbf{x}$ is $(\theta_{\mathbf{m}}, \theta_0^+) - (u,1)$-free (see Definition 1.16(4)) and if every $\mathbf{x}_\ell$ is θ_0^+-free then $\mathbf{x}$ is $(\theta_{\mathbf{m}}, u)$-free <u>when</u>:*

$\boxplus$ (a) *$\mathbf{x}_\ell$ is a combinatorial $\langle\partial_\ell\rangle$-parameter for $\ell < \mathbf{k}$*

(b) $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_0 \times \ldots \times \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}-1}$

(c) $u \subseteq \{0, \ldots, \mathbf{k}-1\}$ *and* $\mathbf{m} = |u| > 0$, *hence* $\mathbf{m} \leq \mathbf{k}$

(d) $\theta_0 < \theta_2 < \ldots < \theta_{\mathbf{m}}$ *are regular*

(e) $\mathbf{x}_k$ *is* $(\theta_{m+1}, \theta_m^+)$*-free when* $k \in u \wedge m < \mathbf{m}$

(f) $\partial_{\mathbf{x}_\ell} \leq \theta_0$ *for* $\ell < \mathbf{k}$.

Proof. Without loss of generality $\mathbf{x}$ is disjoint, i.e. the set $S_\ell := S_{\mathbf{x},\ell} = S_{\mathbf{x}_\ell,0}$ are pairwise disjoint for $\ell < \mathbf{k}$. We prove the claim by induction on $\mathbf{m}$ (may fix $\mathbf{k}$ but we vary u and the θ_m's). So let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathrm{add}_{\mathbf{x}}(u^\perp)$ and $\mathscr{U} \subseteq \bigcup\limits_{\ell<\mathbf{k}} {}^{\partial}(S_\ell)$ have cardinality $< \theta_{\mathbf{m}}$ and we have to prove that $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u})$ is $(\infty, \theta_0^+, u, 1)$-free. Clearly this suffices for the first phrase and the second follows recalling 1.7(2).

Case 1: $\mathbf{m} = 1$

So $|u| = 1$ and let $u = \{\ell\}$ hence $\bar\eta \mapsto \eta_\ell$ is a one-to-one function from $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u})$ onto $\mathscr{U}_\ell := \mathscr{U} \cap \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_\ell}$. We know that $\mathbf{x}_\ell$ is (θ_1, θ_0^+)-free and $|\mathscr{U}_\ell| < \theta_1$ hence there is a partition $\langle \mathscr{U}_{\ell,\alpha} : \alpha < \alpha(*)\rangle$ of $\mathscr{U}_\ell$ to sets each of cardinality $\leq \theta_0$ and $h_\ell : \mathscr{U}_\ell \to J_{\mathbf{x}_\ell}$ such that $\alpha < \beta < \alpha(*) \wedge \eta \in \mathscr{U}_{\ell,\alpha} \wedge \nu \in \mathscr{U}_{\ell,\beta} \wedge \partial_\ell > i \notin h_\ell(\nu) \Rightarrow \eta(i) \neq \nu(i)$. For $\alpha < \alpha(*)$ let $\Lambda_\alpha = \{\bar\eta \in \Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u}) : \eta_\ell \in \mathscr{U}_{\ell,\alpha}\}$, clearly $\langle \Lambda_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(*)\rangle$ is a partition of $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u})$ to sets each of cardinality $\leq \theta_0$. Let the function g from $\alpha(*)$ to $[u]^1 = \{\{\ell\}\}$ be defined by $g(\alpha) = \ell$, clearly the partition $\langle \Lambda_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(*)\rangle$ and the functions g, h_ℓ witness that $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u})$ is $(\theta_{\mathbf{m}}, \theta_0^+)$-free, as required.

Case 2: $\mathbf{m} > 1$

Let $m = \mathbf{m} - 1$, as $\mathbf{m} > 1$, clearly m is ≥ 1. So for $k < \mathbf{k}$ the c.p. $\mathbf{x}_k$ is $(|\mathscr{U}|^+, \theta_m^+)$-free and letting $\mathscr{U}_k = \mathscr{U} \cap {}^{\partial(k)}(S_k) \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_k}$, clearly by 1.11 applied with $\{k\}, 1$ here standing for u, k there, we can find a function $h_k : \mathscr{U}_k \to J_{\mathbf{x}_k}$ such that in the directed graph $(\mathscr{U}_k, R_k)$ each node has out-valency $\leq \theta_m$, that is, $(\forall \eta \in \mathscr{U}_k)(\exists^{\leq \theta_m} \nu \in \mathscr{U}_u)[\eta R_k \nu]$, where

$(*)_1$ $R_k = R_{k,h_k} = \{(\eta, \nu) : \eta, \nu \in \mathscr{U}_k$ and for some $i < \partial_k, i \notin h_k(\nu)$ we have $\eta(i) = \nu(i)\}$.

So

$(*)_2$ let Λ_* be $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u}) = \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U} \cup \mathbf{u}) \backslash \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}, \mathbf{u})$

and let

$(*)_3$ $R_* = \{(\bar\eta, \bar\nu) : \bar\eta, \bar\nu \in \Lambda_*$ and for some $k \in u$ we have $\eta_k R_k \nu_k$ and $\ell < \mathbf{k} \wedge \ell \neq k \Rightarrow \eta_\ell = \nu_\ell\}$.

Clearly

$(*)_4$ (Λ_*, R_*) is a directed graph with each node having out-valency $\leq \theta_m$.

Let $\bar\Lambda = \langle \Lambda_\gamma : \gamma < \gamma(*)\rangle$ be such that:

$(*)_5$ (a) $\bar\Lambda$ is a partition of Λ_*

(b) Λ_γ has cardinality $\leq \theta_m$

(c) if $\bar\eta \in \Lambda_\beta, \bar\nu \in \Lambda_\gamma, \beta < \gamma < \gamma(*)$ <u>then</u> $\neg(\bar\eta R_* \bar\nu)$; that is

- if $\ell \in u$ and $\bar\eta \restriction (\ell, <0) = \bar\nu \restriction (\ell, <0)$ <u>then</u> $\neg(\eta_\ell R_\ell \nu_\ell)$.

[Why? Just look at the definition of the R_k's.]

$(*)_6$ it is enough to prove for each $\gamma < \gamma(*)$ that Λ_γ is (∞, θ_0^+, u)-free.

[Why? It is enough to prove Λ_* is (∞, θ_0^+, u)-free.

By the assumption of $(*)_6$ for each $\gamma < \gamma(*)$ let $\bar{\Lambda}_\gamma, g_\gamma, \bar{h}_\gamma$ witness that Λ_γ is (∞, θ_0^+, u)-free, that is:

- $\bar{\Lambda}_\gamma = \langle \Lambda_{\gamma,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \varepsilon_\gamma \rangle$ is a partition of Λ_γ
- $g_\gamma : \varepsilon_\gamma \to u$
- if $\bar{\eta}, \bar{\nu} \in \Lambda_{\gamma,\varepsilon}$ and $k < \mathbf{k}, k \neq g_\gamma(\varepsilon)$ then $\eta_k = \nu_k$
- $\bar{h}_\gamma = \langle h_{\gamma,k} : k \in u \rangle$
- $h_{\gamma,m}$ is a function from Λ_γ into J_m
- if $\bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_\gamma$ and $\bar{\nu} \in \cup\{\Lambda_{\gamma,\xi} : \xi < \varepsilon\}, m = g_\gamma(\varepsilon), \bar{\nu}\restriction(m) = \bar{\eta} \restriction (m)$ and $i \in \partial_k \backslash h_{\gamma,k}(\bar{\eta})$ then $\eta_k(i) \neq \nu_k(i)$.

Let

- $\zeta_\gamma = \sum\limits_{\beta<\gamma} \varepsilon_\beta$ for $\gamma \leq \gamma(*)$
- $\zeta_* = \zeta_{\gamma(*)}$
- $\Lambda_\varepsilon = \Lambda_{\gamma,\varepsilon-\zeta_\gamma}$ when $\varepsilon \in [\zeta_\gamma, \zeta_{\gamma+1}]$
- g is the function with domain ζ_*
- $g(\varepsilon) = g_\gamma(\varepsilon - \zeta_\gamma)$ when $\varepsilon \in [\zeta_\gamma, \zeta_{\gamma+1}), \gamma < \gamma(*)$
- $h_k = \cup\{h_{\gamma,k} : \gamma < \gamma(*)\}$.

Now check Definition 1.6(4).]

Fix $\gamma < \gamma(*)$. If $|\Lambda_\gamma| < \theta_m$ this follows from the induction hypothesis so assume $|\Lambda_\gamma| = \theta_m$. Let $\langle \eta_{\gamma,\alpha} : \alpha < \theta_m \rangle$ list $\{\nu_k : \bar{\nu} \in \Lambda_\gamma \text{ and } k \in u\}$.

For $\beta < \theta_m$ let $\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta} = \{\eta_{\gamma,\alpha} : \alpha < \beta\}$ and for $\beta < \theta_m$ let $k(\beta)$ be the unique $k \in u$ such that $\eta_{\gamma,\beta} \in {}^{\partial}(S_k)$. Clearly $|\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta}| < \theta_m$, hence by the induction hypothesis, $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta}, \mathbf{u})$ is $(\infty, \theta_0^+, u\backslash\{k\})$-free for each $k \in u$. Also $\langle \mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta} : \beta < \theta_m \rangle$ is $\subseteq$-increasing continuous with union $\cup\{\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta}, \mathbf{u}) : \beta < \theta_m\} = \Lambda_\gamma$.

By induction on $\beta < \theta_m$ we choose $\langle \bar{\Lambda}_\beta, g_\beta, \bar{h}^\beta \rangle$ such that

$(*)_7$ (a) $\bar{\Lambda}_\beta = \langle \Lambda_{\gamma,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \varepsilon_\beta \rangle$ is a partition of $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta}, \mathbf{u})$ so $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow \bar{\Lambda}_\alpha \lhd \bar{\Lambda}_\beta$

(b) each $\Lambda_{\gamma,\varepsilon}$ has cardinality $\leq \theta_0$

(c) $g_\beta : \varepsilon_\beta \to u$ such that $\alpha_1 < \beta \Rightarrow g_\alpha \subseteq g_\beta$

(d) $\bar{h}^\beta = \langle h^\beta_k : k \in u \rangle$

(e) $h_{\beta,k} : \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta}, \mathbf{u}) \to J_k$ and $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow h^\alpha_k \subseteq h^\beta_k$

(f) if $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_\beta, \bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\gamma,\varepsilon}, g_\beta(\bar{\eta}) = k$ so $k \in u$ and $\bar{\nu} \in \cup\{\Lambda_{\gamma,\zeta} : \zeta < \varepsilon\}$ and $\bar{\nu} \restriction (k, < 0) = \bar{\eta} \restriction (k, < 0)$ <u>then</u> $i \in \partial_{\mathbf{x},k} \backslash h_{\beta,k}(\bar{\eta}) \Rightarrow \nu_k(i) \neq \eta_k(i)$.

For $\beta = 0, \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta}, \mathbf{u}) = \emptyset$ so this is obvious. Also for β limit there is nothing to do.

Lastly, for $\beta = \beta_* + 1$, it is enough to show that $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta}, \mathbf{u})$ is (∞, θ_0^+, u)-free over $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta_*}, \mathbf{u})$. Now $\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta} \backslash \mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta_*} = \{\eta_{\gamma,\beta_*}\}, \eta_{\gamma,\beta_*} \in {}^{\partial}(S_{k(\beta_*)})$, hence $\eta_{\gamma,\beta_*} \in$

$\mathscr{U}$. So let $\mathbf{u}_{\gamma,\beta} = \mathbf{u}\backslash\{k(\beta_*)\}, \mathbf{u}_{\gamma,\beta} = \mathbf{u} \cup \{\eta_{\gamma,\beta_*}\}$, so $\mathbf{u}_{\gamma,\beta} \in \mathrm{add}_{\mathbf{x}}(u^{\perp}_{\gamma,\beta}), \mathbf{u}_{\gamma,\beta} \subseteq \{0,\dots,\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}-1\}$ has m members because $|\mathbf{u}| = \mathbf{m} = m+1$. Recall $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta}, \mathbf{u}_{\gamma,\beta}) = \Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta}, \mathbf{u})\backslash\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta_*}, \mathbf{u})$ and by the induction hypothesis on m we know $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta}, \mathbf{u}_{\gamma,\beta})$ is $(\infty, \theta_0^+, u_{\gamma,\beta})$-free so there is a witness $(\bar{\Lambda}^*_{\gamma,\beta}, g^*_{\gamma,\beta}, \bar{h}^*_{\gamma,\beta})$, i.e. is as in 1.6(4)(d) for $k=1$, in particular:

$(*)_8$ $\bar{\Lambda}^*_{\gamma,\beta} = \langle \Lambda^*_{\gamma,\beta,\zeta} : \zeta < \zeta_{\gamma,\beta}\rangle$ is a partition of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta}, \mathbf{u}_{\gamma,\beta})$.

We define

$(*)_9$
- $\varepsilon_\beta = \varepsilon_{\beta_*} + \zeta_{\gamma,\beta}$
- $\Lambda_{\varepsilon_{\beta_*}+\zeta} = \Lambda^*_{\gamma,\beta,\zeta}$ for $\zeta < \zeta_{\gamma,\beta}$
- $g_\beta(\varepsilon_{\beta_*} + \zeta) = g^*_{\beta,\gamma}(\zeta)$ for $\eta < \zeta_{\gamma,\beta}$, i.e. g_β is the function with domain ε_β extending g_{β_*} and defined in $[\varepsilon_{\beta_*}, \varepsilon_\beta)$ as above
- $h_{\beta,k}$ is the function with domain $\Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta,\mathbf{u}}) = \cup\{\Lambda_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \varepsilon_\beta\}$ extending $h_{\beta_*,k}$
- $h_{\beta,k}(\bar{\eta}) = h^*_{\gamma,\beta,k}(\bar{\eta})$ if $\bar{\eta} \in \Lambda^*_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma,\beta}, \mathbf{u}_{\gamma,\beta})$.

Now check, notice that if $\xi < \varepsilon_{\beta_*} \le \varepsilon < \varepsilon_\beta$ and $\bar{\nu} \in \Lambda_{\gamma,\xi}$ and $\eta \in \Lambda_{\gamma,\varepsilon} = \Lambda^*_{\gamma,\beta,\varepsilon-\varepsilon_{\beta_*}}$ and $m = g_\beta(\varepsilon) = g^*_{\beta,\gamma}(\varepsilon - \varepsilon_{\beta_*})$ then $m \neq k(\beta_*)$ and $\eta_{k(\beta_*)} \neq \nu_{k(\beta_*)}$, so no problem arise and the rest should be clear. $\square_{1.18}$

Now (we may assume $\ell < \mathbf{k} \Rightarrow \partial_\ell = \partial$ to simplify, anyhow we have not sorted out what occurred to $(B)(d)$ when $\bar{\partial}$ is not constant)

Theorem 1.19. *If (A) then (B) where:*

(A) (a) $\bar{\partial} = \langle \partial_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k}\rangle$ *such that* $\ell < \mathbf{k} \Rightarrow \partial_\ell \le \partial \wedge \sigma < \partial_\ell$

(b) $\mu_\ell \in \mathbf{C}_{\partial_\ell}$ *for* $\ell < \mathbf{k}$

(c) $\mu_\ell < \mu_{\ell+1}$ *for* $\ell < \mathbf{k}$

(d) $\chi_\ell = 2^{\mu_\ell}$

(e) $\mu_\ell < \mu_{\ell+1}$

(f) $J_\ell = J = J^{\mathrm{bd}}_\sigma \times J^{\mathrm{bd}}_{\partial_\ell}$

(B) *there is* $\mathbf{x}$ *such that:*

(a) $\mathbf{x}$ *is a combinatorial* $\bar{\partial}$*-parameter with* $J_{\mathbf{x},\ell} = J$

(b) $\mathbf{x}$ *has a* $\bar{\chi}$*-black box*

(c) $\mathbf{x}$ *is* (θ_*, θ)*-free* <u>*when*</u> $\theta \ge \partial, \theta_* = \theta^{+\partial\cdot(3m(*)+1)+1} < \mu_0$ *and* $3m(*)+2 < \mathbf{k}$

(d) $\mathbf{x}$ *is* θ_**-free when* $\theta_* = \partial^{+(\partial\cdot m)} < \mu, 3m < \mathbf{k}$ *and* $\bigwedge\limits_\ell \partial_\ell = \partial$

Proof. For each $\ell < \mathbf{k}$ we can choose $\mathbf{x}_\ell$ such that:

$\boxplus$ (a) $\mathbf{x}_\ell$ is a combinatorial $\langle\partial_\ell\rangle$-parameter

(b) $\mathbf{x}_\ell$ is $(\theta^{+\partial+1}, \theta^{+4})$-free when $\partial_\ell \le \theta < \mu_0$

(c) $\mathbf{x}_\ell$ has χ_ℓ-black box.

[Why? By [Sh:1008, 0.4,0.5,0.6=y19,y22,y40].]

Let $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_0 \times \mathbf{x}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}-1}$ and we shall show it is as required.

Clause (B)(a) which says "$\mathbf{x}$ is a combinatorial $\bar{\partial}$-parameter", holds by 1.14(1), i.e. by induction on $\mathbf{k}$.

Clause (B)(b) which says "$\mathbf{x}$ has a $\bar{\chi}$-BB" holds by 1.15, again by induction on $\mathbf{k}$.

Clause (B)(d) follows from clause (B)(c) for $\theta_0 = \partial$, by the second phrase in the conclusion of the Freeness Theorem 1.18.

We are left with clause (B)(c), which follows by 1.18 + $\boxplus(b)$ so let $\langle \theta_m : m \le m(*) \rangle$ be such that: $m(*) = 3n(*) + 1, \theta_i = \partial^{+\iota}$ for $\iota = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and $\theta_{3+3m+\iota} = (\theta_{3+3m})^{+\iota}$ for $\iota = 1, 2, 3$ when $3 + 3m + 3 < m(*)$ and $\theta_{m(*)} = \theta^{+\partial+1}_{3m_*+3} < \mu_0$, noting that if $\theta_{m+1} = \theta^+_m$ then being $(\theta_{m+1}, \theta^+_m, u, k)$-free is trivial. $\square_{1.19}$

Conclusion 1.20. *1) If $\sigma < \partial$ are regular and $\chi \ge \partial$ and $\mathbf{k} \ge 1$ then there is an $\aleph_{\partial \cdot \mathbf{k}}$-free, m-c.p. $\mathbf{x}$ for some m which has the χ-BB and $\|\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\| < \beth_{\partial \cdot \omega}(\chi)$ and $J_{\mathbf{x},m} = J^{\rm bd}_\sigma \times J^{\rm bd}_\partial$.*
2) If $\sigma = \partial$ is regular and $\chi \ge \partial$ and $\mathbf{k} \ge 1$ then there is an $\aleph_{\partial \cdot \mathbf{k}}$-free m-c.p. (for some m) $\mathbf{x}$ which is not free and $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ is not even the union of $\le \chi$ free subsets and $\mathbf{x}$ has cardinality $< \beth_{\partial \cdot \omega}$ and $J_{\mathbf{x},m} = J^{\rm bd}_\partial$.
3) If $m = 3\mathbf{k} + 1, \sigma = {\rm cf}(\sigma) < \partial = {\rm cf}(\partial) < \chi < \mu_0 < \ldots < \mu_{m-1}$ and $\mu_\ell \in \mathbf{C}_\partial$ for $\ell < m, \lambda_\ell = {\rm cf}(2^{\mu_\ell}), S_\ell \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda_\ell : {\rm cf}(\delta) = \sigma\}$ stationary then we have (a) or (b):

- *(A) for some ℓ there is a $\mathscr{F} \subseteq {}^\partial(\mu_\ell)$ of cardinality 2^{μ_ℓ} which is μ^+_ℓ-free*
- *(B) omitting the freeness demands in parts (1),(2) we can choose $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_0 \times \ldots \times \mathbf{x}_{m-1}, \mathbf{x}_\ell$ is a 1-c.p., $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}_\ell} = \{\eta_{\ell,\delta} : \delta \in S_\ell\}, \lim_{J_{\mathbf{x}_\ell}}(\eta_{\ell,\delta}) = \delta$.*

4) For part (2) there is an example as in (3) when $\partial < \mu_0 < \ldots < \mu_{m-1}, {\rm cf}(\mu_\ell) = \partial$ and $\lambda_\ell = \mu$.

Proof. 1) By 1.19.
2) By (4).
3) Straight by [Sh:898], not that.
4) Easier than (3). $\square_{1.20}$

Discussion 1.21. 1) Note that quoting [Sh:1008, 0.4=y19], if clause (A) there holds we get more than promised (μ^+_i-free) so we may concentrate on the case we assume always (B) there holds. We shall return to this.
2) We can vary the definition of the BB, using values in χ or using models.
3) We can use just product of two combinatorial parameters but with any $\mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}$. At present this makes no real difference.
4) Actually in 1.20(2) we can get $\mathbf{x}$ of cardinality $< \aleph_{\partial \cdot \omega}$.

Discussion 1.22. Assume $\mathbf{x}$ is a combinatorial $\bar{\partial}$-parameter, $\bar{\partial} = \bar{\partial}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\bar{\partial}' = \langle \partial'_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle$ is a sequence of limit ordinals such that $\ell < \mathbf{k} \Rightarrow {\rm cf}(\partial'_\ell) = \partial_\ell$.

It follows that there is $\mathbf{y}$ such that:

- $(*)$ (a) $\mathbf{y}$ is a combinatorial $\bar{\partial}'$-parameter
  - (b) $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{y},\ell} = \{\partial'_\ell \alpha + i : \alpha \in S_{\mathbf{x},\ell}$ and $i < \partial'_\ell\}$
  - (c) $\Lambda_{\mathbf{y}} = \{g(\bar\eta) : \bar\eta \in \Lambda\}$ where

(d) $g : \bar{S}^{[\bar{\partial}]}_{\mathbf{x}} \to \bar{S}^{[\bar{\partial}']}_{\mathbf{y}}$ is defined as follows: for each $\ell < \mathbf{k}$ for some increasing continuous sequence $\langle \varepsilon_{\ell,i} : i \le \partial_\ell \rangle$ or ordinals with $\varepsilon_{\ell,0} = 0, \varepsilon_{\ell,\partial_\ell} = \partial'_\ell$ we have is $g(\bar{\eta}) = \bar{\nu}$ iff $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k} \rangle$, $\bar{\nu} = \langle \nu_\ell : \ell < k \rangle$ and $\varepsilon_{\ell,i} \le \varepsilon < \varepsilon_{\ell,i+1} \Rightarrow \nu_\ell(\varepsilon) = \partial'_\ell = \eta_\ell(i) + \varepsilon$ (of course, we could have "economical")

(e) if $\mathbf{x}$ has $\bar{\chi} = \mathrm{BB}$ and $\chi_\ell = \chi_\ell^{\partial'_\ell}$ for $\ell < \mathbf{k}$ then $\mathbf{y}$ has $\bar{\chi} - \mathrm{BB}$.

Definition 1.23. We say a $\mathbf{k}$-c.p. $\mathbf{x}$ is (θ, σ)-well orderable $(\bar{\chi}, \mathbf{k}, 1)$-BB when there is a witness $\bar{\Lambda}$ which means:

(a) $\bar{\Lambda} = \langle \Lambda_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$
(b) $\bar{\Lambda}$ is increasing continuous
(c) $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) \ge \sigma$
(d) if $\alpha < \delta$ then $\mathbf{x}{\restriction}(\Lambda_{\alpha+1} \backslash \Lambda_\alpha)$ has $\bar{\chi}$-black box
(e) if $\alpha < \delta, \bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\alpha+1} \backslash \Lambda$ and $m < \mathbf{k}$ then the following set belongs to $J_{\mathbf{x},m}$:
- $\{i < \partial_{\mathbf{x},m}$: for some $\bar{\nu} \in \Lambda_\alpha$ we have $\bar{\eta} \restriction (m,i) = \bar{\nu} \restriction (m,i)$.

Claim 1.24. *1) In Theorem 1.19, for any $\theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta) \le \chi_{\mathbf{k}-1}$.*

Clause (B)(b) can be strengthened to: $\mathbf{x}$ has θ-well orderable $\bar{\chi}$-black box.

2) Parallely in Conclusion 1.20.

§ 2. Building Abelian groups with small dual and modules

§ 2(A). **Quite Free Ones.**

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathbf{x}$ be a tree-like[7] combinatorial $\bar{\partial}$-parameters and let $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}$.
1) If $k < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}} \Rightarrow \partial_\ell = \aleph_0$, then we say an Abelian group G is derived from $\mathbf{x}$ when

(a) G is generated by $X \cup Y$ where:

$$X = \{x_{\bar{\eta}\restriction(m,n)} : m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}, n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{z\}$$

$$Y = \{y_{\bar{\eta},n} : \bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

(b) moreover generated freely except the following set of equations

$$\Xi_{\mathbf{x}} = \{(n+1)y_{\bar{\eta},n+1} = y_{\bar{\eta},n} - \quad \Sigma\{x_{\bar{\eta}\restriction(m,n)} : m < \mathbf{k}\} - a_{\bar{\eta},n}z_{\bar{\eta}} : \bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}} \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

where

- $\bullet_1$ $z_{\bar{\eta}} \in \Sigma\{\mathbb{Z}x_{\bar{\eta}\restriction(m,n)} : \bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}, m < \mathbf{k}, n \in \mathbb{N}\} \oplus \mathbb{Z}z$
- $\bullet_2$ $a_{\bar{\eta},n} \in \mathbb{Z}$.

2) We say the derivation of G in part (1) is well orderable (or "G or $\langle z_{\bar{\eta}} : \bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ universally respect $\mathbf{x}$") when we replace $\bullet_1$ above by:

- $\bullet'_1$ there is a list $\langle \bar{\eta}_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_*\rangle$ of $\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ such that $z_{\bar{\eta}_\alpha} \in \Sigma\{\mathbb{Z}x_{\bar{\eta}_\beta\restriction(m,n)} : \beta < \alpha, m < \mathbf{k}\} \oplus \mathbb{Z}z$ for every $\alpha < \alpha(*)$; such a sequence is called a witness.

3) We add simply (derived) when $z_{\bar{\eta}} = z$ for every $\bar{\eta}$. Similarly in 2.3.

Remark 2.2. 1) We can replace $(n+1)y_{\bar{\eta},n+1}$ by $k_{\bar{\eta},n}y_{\bar{\eta},n+1}$ with $k_{\bar{\eta},n} \in \{2,3,\ldots\}$.
2) By combining Abelian groups, the "simply derived" is enough for cases of the TDC_λ. Instead of "simply derived" we may restrict $\langle z_{\bar{\eta}} : \bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ more than in 2.1(2).

Definition 2.3. 1) We say an R-module G is derived from a combinatorial $\bar{\partial}$-parameter $\mathbf{x}$ when:

(a) G_* is an R-module freely generated by $X_* = \{x_{\bar{\eta}\restriction(m,i)} : m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}, i < \partial_m \text{ and } \bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\} \cup \{z\}$
(b) the R-module G is generated by $\cup\{G_{\bar{\eta}} : \bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\} \cup X_*$, also $G_* \subseteq G$
(c) G/G_* is the direct sum of $\langle (G_{\bar{\eta}} + G_*)/G_* : \bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$
(d) $Z_{\bar{\eta}} \subseteq X_* \subseteq G_*$ for $\bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$; if $Z_{\bar{\eta}} = \{z_{\bar{\eta}}\}$ we may write $z_{\bar{\eta}}$ instead of $Z_{\bar{\eta}}$
(e) if $\bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ then the R-submodule $G_{\bar{\eta}} \cap G_*$ of G is generated by $\{x_{\bar{\eta}\restriction(m,i)} : m < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}} \text{ and } i < \partial_{\mathbf{x},m}\} \cup Z_{\bar{\eta}} \subseteq X_*$.

[7] In [Sh:883] this was not necessary as the definition of $\eta \restriction (m,n)$ there is $\eta \restriction (m, < n+1)$ here.

1A) We say $\mathfrak{x}$ is an R-construction or $(R,\mathbf{x})$-construction when it consists of $\mathbf{x}, R, G_*, G, \langle x_{\bar\eta} : \bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x},<\mathbf{k}}\rangle, \langle G_{\bar\eta}, Z_{\bar\eta} : \bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\rangle$ as above and we shall write $G^{\mathfrak{x}}_* = G_*, G_{\mathfrak{x}} = G, G_{\mathfrak{x},\bar\eta} = G_{\bar\eta}$, etc., (so in 2.1(1) we have a $\mathbb{Z}$-construction with $G_{\bar\eta}/(G_{\bar\eta}\cap G_*)$ being isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Q},+)$). We may say $\mathfrak{x}$ is for $\mathbf{x}$ but we may write G rather than $G_{\mathfrak{x}}$, etc. when $\mathfrak{x}$ is clear from the context.
1B) For an R-construction $\mathfrak{x}$ we say: "universally respecting $\mathbf{x}$" or "$\mathfrak{x}$ is well orderable" when we can find $\bar\Lambda$ which $\mathfrak{x}$ obeys meaning:

- (a) $\bar\Lambda = \langle \Lambda_\alpha : \alpha \le \alpha_*\rangle$ is increasing continuous
- (b) $\Lambda_{\alpha_*} = \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$
- (c) if $\bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\alpha+1}\backslash\Lambda_\alpha$ and $m < \mathbf{k}$ then $\{i < \partial_m : (\exists \bar\nu \in \Lambda_\alpha)(\bar\eta \restriction (m,i) = \bar\nu \restriction (m,i)\} \in J_{\mathbf{x},m}$
- (d) if $\bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\alpha+1}\backslash\Lambda_\alpha$ then $Z_{\bar\eta} \subseteq \langle \{G_{\bar\nu} : \bar\nu \in \Lambda_\alpha\} \cup \{z\}\rangle_G$.

1C) We add "simple" or "simply derived" when $z_{\bar\eta} = z$ hence $Z_{\bar\eta} = \{z\}$ for every $\bar\eta \in \Lambda$. We may say "G is derived from $\mathbf{x}$" and $\mathfrak{x}$ is derived from $\mathbf{x}$.
2) Above we say $\mathfrak{x}$ is a locally free derivation or locally free or G in part (1) is freely derived when in addition:

- (f) if $\bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}, m < \mathbf{k}$ and $w \in J_{\mathbf{x},m}$ then $(G_{\bar\eta}/G_{\bar\eta,m,w})$ is a free R-module where $G_{\bar\eta,m,w}$ is the R-submodule of G generated by $\{x_{\bar\eta\restriction(m_1,i_1)} : m_1 < k, i_1 < \partial_{m_1}$ and $m_1 = m \Rightarrow i_1 \in w\} \cup Z_{\bar\eta}$.

3) Above we say $\mathfrak{x}$ is $(<\theta)$-locally free or $\mathfrak{x}$ is a free $(<\theta)$-derivation when in adding each $G_{\bar\eta}$ is generated by $<\theta$ elements means that:

- $(f)^+$ like (f) but the quotient $G_{\bar\eta}/G_{\bar\eta,n,w}$ is θ-free
- (g) $\mathbf{x}$ is θ-free.

4) In parts (2), (3) replacing free by θ-free is define similarly.
5) We write "explicitly locally free" when we are given alsoa:

- (g) $G_{\bar\eta} = G_{\bar\eta,m,w} \oplus G^{\bar\eta,m,w}$ and $G^{\bar\eta,m,w}$ is θ-free.

Remark 2.4. In the Definition 2.3 we may like in $G_{\bar\eta}$ to have more elements from G_*. This can be accomplished by replacing $x_{\bar\nu}, \bar\nu \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x},<\mathbf{k}}$ by $x_{\bar\nu,t}$ for $t \in T_{m,i}$ when $\bar\nu = \bar\eta \restriction (m,i), \bar\eta \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$.

However, we can just as well replace ∂_ℓ by $\partial'_\ell = \gamma\cdot\partial_\ell$ for some non-zero ordinal (and J_ℓ by $J'_\ell = \{w \subseteq \partial'_\ell$: for some $u \in J_\ell$ we have $w \subseteq \{\gamma i+\beta : \beta < \gamma$ and $i \in u\}\}$.

Claim 2.5. *Assume $\mathfrak{x}$ is a simple R-construction which is a well orderable locally $(<\theta)$-locally-free and $G = G_{\mathfrak{x}}$ so it is derived from $\mathbf{x}$.*
1) G is a θ-free R-module.
2) If $(R,+)$, that is R as an additive (so Abelian) group, is free then $(G,+), G$ as an Abelian group, is θ-free.
3) In part (2) it suffices that $(R,+)$ is a θ-free Abelian group.
4) In (1),(2),(3) we can replace "derived" by $(<\theta)$-derived" and/or can omit "simple".

Remark 2.6. To omit in 2.5 the "simply" seems to lead to more complicated conditions.

Proof. 1) Let $X \subseteq G$ have cardinality $< \theta$. By the Definition 2.3 there are $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ of cardinality $< \theta$ and $\Lambda_* \subseteq \Lambda_{\mathbf{x},<\mathbf{k}}$ of cardinality $< \theta$ such that $X \subseteq \langle \{x_{\bar\eta} : \bar\eta \in \Lambda_*\} \cup \{G_{\bar\eta,m,i} : \bar\eta \in \Lambda\}\rangle_G$, so without loss of generality $X = \{x_{\bar\eta} : \bar\eta \in \Lambda_*\} \cup \{Y_{\bar\eta} : \bar\eta \in \Lambda\}$ where $G_{\bar\eta}$ is generated by $Y_{\bar\eta}, Y_{\bar\eta} \subseteq G_{\bar\eta}, |Y_{\bar\eta}| < \theta_1$ and $\bar\eta \in \Lambda, m < \mathbf{k}, i < \partial_m \Rightarrow \bar\eta \restriction (m,i) \in \Lambda_*$. Let $\bar\Lambda$ witness the well orderability of $\mathfrak{r}$ (so enough for Λ!). As $\mathbf{x}$ is θ-free we can find the following objects:

- (a) $\langle \bar\eta_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha_*\rangle$ list Λ
- (b) $m_\alpha < \mathbf{k}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $w_\alpha \in J_{\mathbf{x},\alpha}$ for $\alpha < \alpha_*$
- (c) if $\alpha < \beta$ and $i \in \partial_{\mathbf{x},m_\beta} \backslash w_\beta$ then $\eta_{\beta,m}(i) \neq \eta_{\alpha,m}(i)$.

Without loss of generality

- (d) $h : \alpha_* \to \ell g(\bar\Lambda)$ is non-decreasing and $\bar\eta_\alpha \in \Lambda_{h(\alpha)}$.

For $\alpha \leq \alpha(*)$, let $G_\alpha = \langle \cup\{G_{\bar\eta_\beta} : \beta < \alpha\}\rangle_G$ and let $G_{\alpha(*)+1} = \langle G_{\alpha(*)} \cup \{x_{\bar\eta} : \bar\eta \in \Lambda_*\}\rangle_G$.

So $\langle G_\alpha : \alpha \leq \alpha(*)+1\rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of sub-modules, $G_0 = 0$ and $G_{\alpha(*)+1}$ includes X.

Lastly, $G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$ is a free R-module. Just check the way $G_{\mathfrak{r}}$ is generated. So clearly we are done.

2),3) Follows.

4) Similarly. $\square_{2.5}$

Definition 2.7. 1) An Abelian group H is $(\theta_2,\theta_1)-1$-free <u>when</u>: if $X \subseteq G, |X| < \theta_2$ then we can find a $\bar G$ such that:

- $\bar G = \langle G_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha(*)$ is a sequence of subgroups of G,
- $G := \sum\limits_{\alpha<\alpha(*)} G_\alpha \subseteq H$ include X,
- G_α is generated by a set of $< \theta_1$ members,
- $G = \bigoplus\limits_{\alpha<\alpha(*)} G_\alpha$.

2) Similarly for R-modules.

Discussion 2.8. It is natural to consider the statement: if G is an $\aleph_1$-free Abelian group, $\theta_1 < \theta_2 < \theta_3$ are regular cardinals and G is $(\theta_{\ell+1},\theta_\ell)-1$-free for $\ell = 1,2$ <u>then</u> G is $(\theta_3,\theta_1)-1$-free.

This is known to be false.

Claim 2.9. *If $\mathbf{x}$ is a $\mathbf{k}$-c.p., (θ_2,θ_1)-free and the Abelian group $G_{\mathbf{x}}$ is derived from $\mathbf{x}$ <u>then</u> G is $(\theta_2,\theta_1)-1$-free.*

Proof. Straight. $\square_{2.9}$

Claim 2.10. *Assume $\mathbf{x}$ is an $(\aleph_0,\mathbf{k})$-c.p. with $(\aleph_0,\mathbf{k})$-BB.*
1) There is $\mathbb{Z}$-construction $\mathfrak{r}$ such that:

- (a) *$G = G_{\mathfrak{r}}$ so G is an Abelian group of cardinality $|\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}|$*
- (b) *G is not Whitehead*
- (c) *G is θ-free if $\mathbf{x}$ is θ-free*
- (d) *G is $(\theta_2,\theta_1)-1$-free if $\mathbf{x}$ is (θ_2,θ_1)-free, see 2.7(1)*

(e) *G has cardinality $|\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}|$*

(f) *G has a $\mathbb{Z}$-adic dense subgroup of cardinality $|\Lambda_{\mathbf{x},<\mathbf{k}}|$.*

2) We can add:

(b)$^+$ $\mathrm{Hom}(G,\mathbb{Z})=0$.

Remark 2.11. Recall that $(\chi,\mathbf{k})$-BB means $\mathbf{b}$ is a function with range $\subseteq\chi$.

Proof. 1) Let $G_0=\oplus\{\mathbb{Z}x_{\bar\eta}:\bar\eta\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{x},<\mathbf{k}}\}\oplus\mathbb{Z}z$ and G_1 be the $\mathbb{Z}$-adic closure of G_0 so G_1 is a complete metric space under the $\mathbb{Z}$-adic metric.

For $\bar\eta\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\bar a\in{}^{\omega}\mathbb{Z}$ and $n(*)$, in G_1 we let $y_{\bar a,\bar\eta,n(*)}=\sum\limits_{n\geq n(*)}(n!/n(*)!)(\sum\limits_m x_{\bar\eta\restriction(m,n)}+a_nz)$.

Let $\mathbb{Z}=\{b_i:i<\omega\}$ and let $\bar{\mathbf{c}}=\langle c_m:m<\mathbf{k}\rangle$ be an $(\aleph_0,\mathbf{k})$-BB. Now for each $\bar\eta\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ let $G^0_{\bar\eta}=\Sigma\{\mathbb{Z}x_{\bar\eta\restriction(m,n)}:m<\mathbf{k},n<\omega\}\oplus\mathbb{Z}z$ and $h_{\bar\eta}\in\mathrm{Hom}(G^0_{\bar\eta},\mathbb{Z})$ such that $h_{\bar\eta}(z)=1,h_{\bar\eta}(x_{\bar\eta\restriction(m,n)})=b_{\mathbf{c}_m(\bar\eta\restriction(m,n)}$.

We can choose $\bar a=\bar a[\bar\eta]\in{}^{\omega}\mathbb{Z}$ such that there is no extension $h^1\in\mathrm{Hom}(G^1_{\bar\eta},\mathbb{Z})$ of $h_{\bar\eta}$ where $G^1_{\bar a,\bar\eta}=\langle G^0_{\bar\eta}\cup\{y_{\bar a,\bar\eta,n}:n<\omega\}\rangle_{G_1}$.

Lastly, $G=\langle G_0\cup\{y_{\bar a[\bar\eta],\bar\eta,n}:n<\omega\}:\bar\eta\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}\}\rangle_{G_1}$; easily it is as required.

Now G witness that $G/\mathbb{Z}z$ is not a Whitehead group. The cardinality and freeness demands are obvious.

2) If we assume $\mathbf{x}$ has $(\aleph_0,\mathbf{k},|\Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}|)$-BB, which holds in all present applications, we have a similar proof. Anyhow this follows easily by repeated amalgamation of the G constructed in part (1) over pure subgroups isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$, see, e.g. [Sh:1005, §3]. $\square_{2.10}$

* * *

Now claim 2.10 as stated is not so useful, as our results on §1 are for $\partial=\aleph_1,J=J_{\sigma\times\kappa},\sigma<\kappa$ regular in particular $(\sigma,\kappa)=(\aleph_0,\aleph_1)$ so for the case $\partial_m=\aleph_1$. So we better use the construction from Definition 2.3 rather than 2.1. Also we prefer to have general R-modules and we formalize the relevant property of $R,\bar\partial,\bar J,\theta$.

Definition 2.12. 1) We say that $(\bar\partial,\bar J)$ does θ-fit R <u>or</u> $(\bar\partial,\bar J,\theta)$ fit R (but if $\bar\partial=\bar\partial'_{\mathbf{x}},\bar J=\bar J_{\mathbf{x}}$ then we may write $\mathbf{x}$ instead of $(\bar\partial,J)$ <u>when</u>:

(A) (a) R is a ring

(b) $\mathbf{k}$ is a natural number

(c) $\bar\partial=\langle\partial_\ell:\ell<\mathbf{k}\rangle$

(d) ∂_ℓ is a regular cardinal

(B) If $G_0=\oplus\{Rx_{m,i}:m<\mathbf{k},i<\partial_m\}\oplus Rz$ and $h\in\mathrm{Hom}(G_0,{}_RR),h(z)\neq0$ <u>then</u> there is G_1 is

($*$) (α) G_1 is an R-module extending G_0

(β) G_1 has cardinality $<\theta$

(γ) there is no homomorphism from G_1 to ${}_RR$ (i.e. R as a left R-module) extending h.

2) We say $(\bar\partial,\bar J)$ freely θ-fits R or $(\bar\partial,\bar J,\theta)$-fit R (but if $\bar\partial=\bar\partial_{\mathbf{x}},\bar J=\bar J_{\mathbf{x}}$ we may replace $(\bar\partial,\bar J)$ by $\mathbf{x}$) <u>when</u>:

(A) $(a)-(d)$ as above

(e) $\bar{J}=\langle J_\ell:\ell<\mathbf{k}\rangle$

(f) J_ℓ is an ideal on ∂_ℓ.

(B) as above adding

(δ) if $m_*<\mathbf{k}\wedge w\in J_{m_*}$ then G_1 is free over $\oplus\{Rx_{m,i}:m<\mathbf{k},i<\partial_m$ and $m=m_*\Rightarrow i\in w\}\oplus Rz$.

3) In part (1) above and also parts (3),(4) below we may write $(\partial,J,\mathbf{k})$ instead of $(\langle\partial_\gamma:\ell<\mathbf{k}\rangle,\langle J_\ell:\ell<\mathbf{k}\rangle)$ when $\ell<\mathbf{k}\Rightarrow\partial_\ell=\partial\wedge J_\ell=J$. In parts (3),(4) we may write J if $m<k\Rightarrow J_m=J$ and omit $\bar{J}$ when $\ell<\mathbf{k}\Rightarrow J_\ell=J^{\rm bd}_{\partial_\ell}$.
4) we may above replace "J_ℓ is an ideal on ∂_ℓ" by $J_\ell\subseteq\mathscr{P}(\partial_\ell)$.
5) We may omit θ when $\theta=|R|^+ +\max\{\partial^+_m:m<\mathbf{k}\}$.
6) We replace fit by $\mathbb{I}$-fit when we:

(a) $\mathbb{I}$ is a set of ideals of R closed under intersection of two including $\mathbb{I}_0$

(b) replace Rz by $(R/I)z, I\in\mathbb{I}$. The default value of $\mathbb{I}$ is $\{\{a:ab=0\}:b\in R\}$

(c) in $(B)(*)$, if $x\in G_1\backslash\{0\}$ then $\mathrm{ann}(x,\theta_1)=\{a\in R:ax=0\}\in\mathbb{I}$.

Claim 2.13. *1) Assume* $\mathbf{x}$ *is a* $\mathbf{k}$*-c.p., R is a ring,* $\mathbf{x}$ *does θ-fit $R,\chi^+\geq\theta+|R|^+$ and* $\mathbf{x}$ *has $(\chi,\mathbf{k},1)$-BB.*

There is $\mathfrak{r}$ *such that:*

(a) $\mathfrak{r}$ *is an $(R,\mathbf{x})$-construction*

(b) *$G=G_\mathfrak{r}$ is an R-module of cardinality $|\Lambda_\mathbf{x}|$*

(c) *there is no $h\in\mathrm{Hom}(G,{}_RR)$ such that $h(z)\neq 0$*

(d) $\mathfrak{r}$ *is simple, that is, $z_{\bar\eta}=z$ for $\bar\eta\in\Lambda_\mathbf{x}$.*

2) If in addition $\mathbf{x}$ *freely θ-fit R, then we can add:*

(e) *G is σ-free if* $\mathbf{x}$ *is σ-free (holds always for $\sigma=\min(\bar\partial_\mathbf{x})$)*

(f) *G is $(\theta_2,\theta_1)-1$-free if* $\mathbf{x}$ *is (θ_2,θ_1)-free.*

3) In (2) we can add:

(e) $\mathrm{Hom}(G,{}_RR)=0$.

Proof. Let $G_*=\oplus\{Rx_{\bar\eta}:\bar\eta\in\Lambda_{\mathbf{x},<\mathbf{k}}\}\oplus Rz$.
1) Let $\{(a^1_\varepsilon,a^2_\varepsilon):\varepsilon<\chi\}$ list, possibly with repetitions the members of $R\times R$ and let $\mathbf{b}$ be a $(\chi,\mathbf{k},1)$-BB for $\mathbf{x}$ and let $\mathbf{b}',\mathbf{b}''$ be defined such that: $\varepsilon=\mathbf{b}_{\bar\eta}(m,\ell)$ implies $\mathbf{b}'_\eta(m,i)=a^1_\varepsilon,\mathbf{b}''_{\bar\eta}(m,i):=a^2_\varepsilon$.

For $\bar\eta\in\Lambda_\mathbf{x}$ let $G^0_{\bar\eta}=\Sigma\{Rx_{\bar\eta\restriction(m,i)}:m<\mathbf{k},i<\partial_\ell\}\oplus Rz\subseteq G_*$ and let $h_{\bar\eta}$ be the unique homomorphism from $G^0_{\bar\eta}$ into ${}_RR$ satisfying $h_{\bar\eta}(x_{\bar\eta\restriction(m,i)})=\mathbf{b}'_{\bar\eta}(m,i)$ and $h_{\bar\eta}(z)=b''_{\bar\eta}(0,0)$ and let $G^1_{\bar\eta}$ be an R-module extending $G^0_{\bar\eta}$ such that $(G^1_{\bar\eta},G^0_{\bar\eta}),h_{\bar\eta}$ here are like (G_1,G_0,h) in Definition 2.12(1), so in particular there is no homomorphism from $G^1_{\bar\eta}$ into ${}_RR$ extending $h^0_{\bar\eta}$. Without loss of generality $G^1_{\bar\eta}\cap G_0=G^0_{\bar\eta}$ and $\langle G^1_{\bar\eta}\backslash G^0_{\bar\eta}:\bar\eta\in\Lambda_\mathbf{x}\rangle$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint sets. Let G be the R-module generated by $\cup\{G^1_{\bar\eta}:\bar\eta\in\Lambda_\mathbf{x}\}\cup G_0$ extending each $G^1_{\bar\eta}$ and G_*, freely except this. Clearly we have defined R-construction $\mathfrak{r}$ with $\mathbf{x}_\mathfrak{r}=\mathbf{x},G_\mathfrak{r}=G,z_{\mathfrak{r},\eta}=\{z\}$ and clauses $(a),(b),(d)$ of the desired conclusion holds. To prove clause (c) toward

contradiction assume that $h \in \mathrm{Hom}(G, {}_RR)$ satisfies $h(z) \neq 0$. Let $g : \Lambda_{\mathbf{x},<\mathbf{k}} \to \chi$ be defined by $g(\bar{\nu}) = \min\{\varepsilon < \chi : (h(x_{\bar{\nu}}), h(z)) = (a^1_\varepsilon, a^2_\varepsilon)\}$.

Clearly the function is well defined hence as $\mathbf{x}$ has $(\chi, \mathbf{k}, 1)$-BB, that is by the choice of $\mathbf{b}$ there is $\bar{\eta} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{x}}$ such that $m < \mathbf{k} \wedge i < \partial_m \Rightarrow g(\bar{\eta} \restriction (m,i)) = \mathbf{b}_{\bar{\eta}}(m,i)$. We get easy contradiction.

What about $|G|$? Note that $|G^1_{\bar{\eta}}| < \theta$ and $\theta \leq \chi^+$.

2) In the proof of part (1), choosing G^1_η we add the parallel of clause $(*)(\delta)$ of (B). Now clause (e) of 2.13(2) holds by 2.5(1).

3) Let G be as constructed in part (1), and let $Y = \{y \in G : G/Ry$ is $\aleph_1$-free or even $\min(\bar{\partial})^+$-free (recall 2.5 + freeness of $\mathbf{x})\}$.

So by part (2) the set Y generated G, let $\langle G_\varrho, h_\rho : \varrho \in {}^{\omega>}Y\rangle$ be such that G_ϱ is an R-module, h_ϱ is an isomorphism from G onto G_ϱ, without loss of generality $0_{G_\varrho} = 0$ for every ϱ and $G_{\varrho_1} \cap G_{\varrho_2} = \{0\}$ for $\varrho_1 \neq \varrho_2$.

Let $H_1 = \oplus\{G_\varrho : \varrho \in {}^{\omega>}Y\}$ and let H_0 be the R-submodule of H_1 generated by

$$X = \{h_{\varrho^\frown\langle y\rangle}(z) - h_\varrho(y) : \varrho \in {}^{\omega>}Y \text{ and } y \in Y\}.$$

Lastly, $H := H_1/H_0$ is as required. $\square_{2.13}$

Remark 2.14. An alternative to the proof of 2.13(3), assume that $\mathbf{x}$ has $\aleph_0$-well orderable $(\chi, \mathbf{k}, 1)$-BB $\bar{\alpha}$ as witnessed by $\bar{\Lambda}$, see Definition 1.23. We then can find a $(R, \mathbf{x})$-construction obeying $\bar{\Lambda}$, see 2.3(1B).

Claim 2.15. *Let $\partial = \aleph_0, J = J^{\mathrm{bd}}_\partial$ then $(\partial, J, \mathbf{k})$ freely fit R <u>when</u>:*

- *(a) R is a ring*
- *(b) R has character zero*
- *(c) $(R, +)$ is torsion free or at least $\cap\{nR : n \geq 2\} = \{0\}$.*

Proof. Easy. $\square_{2.15}$

Claim 2.16. *1) The triple $(\aleph_1, J, \mathbf{k})$ freely fit $\mathbb{Z}$ <u>when</u>:*

- *(a) $\mathbf{k} > 0$*
- *(b) $J = J_{\aleph_0 \times \aleph_1}$ or use the isomorphic copy $J_{\aleph_0 * \aleph_1} = \{A$: for some $n_* < \omega, i_* < \omega_1$ we have $A \subseteq \{\omega, i + n : i < i_*$ or $n < n_*\}\}$ or just $J = J_{\aleph_1} * J^{\mathrm{bd}}_{\aleph_0}$.*

2) The triple $(\aleph_1, J, \mathbf{k})$ freely fits R <u>when</u>:

- *(a), (b) as above and*
- *$(d)'$ given $b_{\alpha,n} \in R$ for $\alpha < \omega, n < \omega$ and $t \in R \backslash \{0_R\}$, there are pairwise distinct $\rho_\alpha \in {}^\omega 2$ for $\alpha < \omega_1$ and $a_{\alpha,n}, d_{\alpha,n} \in R$ such that the following set of equations is not solvable in R:*
  - *$d_{\alpha,n+1} y^1_{\alpha,n+1} = y^1_{\alpha,n} - y^2_{\rho_\alpha \restriction n} - b_{\alpha,n} - a_{\alpha,n} t$.*

Remark 2.17. 1) Probably we can use $\bar{\partial} = \langle \partial_\ell : \ell < \mathbf{k}\rangle$ with $\partial_\ell \in \{\aleph_0, \aleph_1\}$ but no real need so far.

2) This is essentially [Sh:98, §4] and [Sh:898, 4.10(C)=L5e.28].

Proof. 1) So let G_0, h be as in 2.12(1)(B).

Now obviously

$\boxplus$ for $n \geq 2$ there is $C_n \subseteq \{0,1,\ldots,(n+2)-1\}$ such that: if $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfies $0 < |t| < n!$ then for some $a_0, a_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

- $b + (n+1)a_0 t \in \cup\{i + (n+2)\mathbb{Z} : i \in C_n\}$
- $b + (n+1)a_1 t \notin \cup\{i + (n+2)\mathbb{Z} : i \in C_n\}$.

Let $\Omega \subseteq {}^{\omega}2$ has cardinality $\aleph_1$ and $\langle \rho_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1 \rangle$ list Ω, without repetitions.

Let G be generated by $\{x_{m,\alpha} : \alpha < \aleph_1, m < \mathbf{k}\} \cup \{y^1_{\rho,n} : \rho \in \Omega \text{ and } n < \omega\} \cup \{y^2_\rho : \rho \in {}^{\omega>}2\} \cup \{z\}$ freely except the equations:

$(*)_{\alpha,n}$ $(n+1)y^1_{\alpha,n+1} = y^1_{\alpha,n} - y^2_{\rho_\alpha \restriction n} - \sum\limits_{m<\mathbf{k}} x_{m,\omega\cdot\alpha+n} - a_{\alpha,n} z$

where $a_{\alpha,m} \in \mathbb{Z}$ are chosen below.

Note that in G

$(*)'_{\alpha,n}$ $y^1_{\alpha,0} = n! y^1_{\alpha,n} + \sum\limits_{n_1<n} \frac{n!}{n_1!}(y^2_{\rho_\alpha \restriction n_1} + \sum\limits_{m<\mathbf{k}_*} x_{m,\omega\cdot\alpha+n} + a_{\alpha,n_1} z)$.

Define

$(*)$ $b_{\alpha,n} = \sum\limits_{n_1 \leq n} h(\sum\limits_{m<\mathbf{k}} \frac{(n+1)!}{n_1!} x_{m,\omega\cdot\alpha+n}) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Recall G_0, h are as in 2.12(1)(B). Let $n_* = |h(z)|$ so $n_* > 0$. We choose $a_{\alpha,n} \in \mathbb{Z}$ by induction on n such that: if $n > |h(z)|$ then

$(*)$ $\rho_\alpha(n) = 1$ <u>iff</u> $(b_{\alpha,n} + \sum\limits_{n_1 \leq n} \frac{(n+1)!}{n_1!} a_{\alpha,n_1} h(z))$ is equal to some $a \in C_n$ modulo $(n+2)$.

[Why possible? Arriving to n, the sum is $b_{\alpha,n} + \sum\limits_{n_1<n} \frac{(n+1)!}{n_1!} a_{\alpha,n_1} h(z)) + (n+1)a_{\alpha,n} h(z)$, with the first summand being determined and $|h(z)| < n$, applying $\boxplus$ with $(n, h(z), b_{\alpha,n} + \Sigma\{\frac{(n+1!}{n_1!} a_{\alpha,n_1} h(z) : n_1 < n\})$ here standing for (n,t,b) there we get there a_0, a_1 so $a_{\rho_\alpha(n)}$ and let $a_{\alpha,n}$ be the parallel here to $a_{\rho_\alpha(n)}$ there. So for every $n, a_{\alpha,n}$ is as required and can be chosen.]

Hence we just have to prove clause (B) of 2.12 so toward contradiction assume that $f \in \mathrm{Hom}(G,\mathbb{Z})$ extend h and $n_* = |f(z)|$ is > 0 hence (for every α, n)

$(*)''_{\alpha,n}$ $(n+1)f(y^1_{\alpha,n}) = f(y^1_{\alpha,0}) + \sum\limits_{n_1<n} \frac{n!}{n_1!} f(y^2_{\rho_\alpha \restriction n_1}) + \sum\limits_{n_1<n} \sum\limits_{m<\mathbf{k}} \frac{n!}{n_1!} f(x_{m,\omega\cdot\alpha+n_1}) + \sum\limits_{n_1<n} \frac{n!}{n_1!} a_{\alpha,n} f(z)$.

So for some $\rho_* \in {}^{n_*+1}2, a_* \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $|S| = \aleph_1$ where $S = \{\alpha < \aleph_1 : f(y^1_{\alpha,0}) \equiv a_*$ and $\rho_\alpha \restriction (n_*+1)) = \rho_*\}$.

So choose $\alpha < \beta$ from S and let $n = \min\{n : \rho_\alpha(n) \neq \rho_\beta(n)\}$, clearly we have $n > n_*$ and substructing the equations $(*)''_{\alpha,n+1}, (*)''_{\beta,n+1}$, in the left side we get a number divisible by $(n+2)$ and in the right side we get the sum of the following differences:

$\odot_1$ $f(y^1_{\alpha,0}) - (f(y^1_{\beta,0})$ which is zero by the choice of S and the demand $\alpha, \beta \in S$

$\odot_2$ $\sum\limits_{n_1 \leq n} \frac{(n+1)!}{n_1!} f(y^2_{\rho_\alpha \restriction n_1}) - \sum\limits_{n_1 \leq n} \frac{(n+1)!}{n_1!} f(y^2_{\rho_\beta \restriction n_1})$ which is zero as $n_1 \leq n \Rightarrow \rho_\alpha \restriction n_1 = \rho_\beta \restriction n_1$

$\odot_3$ $\sum\limits_{n_1\le n}\sum\limits_{m<\mathbf{k}_*}\frac{(n+1)!}{n_1!}f(x_{m,\omega\cdot\alpha+n})-\sum\limits_{n_1\le n}\sum\limits_{m<\mathbf{k}}\frac{(n+1)!}{n_1!}f(x_{m,\omega\cdot\beta+n})$ which is $b_{\alpha,n}-b_{\beta,n}$ by the choice of $b_{\alpha,n},b_{\beta,n}$ as f,h agree on G_0

$\odot_4$ $\sum\limits_{n_1\le n}\frac{(n+1)!}{n_1!}a_{\alpha,n_1}f(z)-\sum\limits_{n_1\le n}\frac{(n+1)!}{n_1!}a_{\beta,n_1}f(z)$.

Hence (recalling $f(z)=h(z)$)

$\boxdot$ $(b_{\alpha,n}+\sum\limits_{n_1\le n}\frac{(n+1)!}{n_1!}a_{\alpha,n_1}f_\alpha(z)-(b_{\beta,n}+\sum\limits_{n_1\le n}\frac{(n+1)!}{n_1!}a_{\alpha,n}f(z)))$ is divisible by $(n+2)$ in $\mathbb{Z}$.

But by the choice of $a_{\alpha,n}$ we know that $(b_{\alpha,n}+\sum\limits_{n_1\le n}\frac{(n+1)!}{n_1!}a_{\alpha,n}f(z))$ is equal modulo $(n+2)$ to some $i\in C_n$ iff $\rho_\alpha(n)=1$. Similarly for β, but $\rho_\alpha(n)\ne\rho_\beta(n)$ contradiction to $\boxdot$.

2) We are given $b_{\alpha,n}(\alpha<\aleph_1,n\in\mathbb{N})$ and t from R. We shall choose $\langle(a_{\alpha,n},d_{\alpha,m}):\alpha<\omega_1,n<\omega\rangle$ and will let G be the R-module generated by $\{x_{m,\alpha}:\alpha<\aleph_1,m<\mathbf{k}\}\cup\{y^1_{\alpha,n}:\alpha<\aleph_1$ and $n<\omega\}\cup\{y^2_{\rho,n}:\rho\in{}^{\omega>}2\}\cup\{z\}$ freely except the equations

$(*)_{\alpha,n}$ $d_{\alpha,n}y^1_{\alpha,n+1}=y^1_{\alpha,n}+y^2_{\rho_\alpha\restriction n}+\sum\limits_{m<\mathbf{k}}x_{m,\omega\cdot\alpha+n}-a_{\alpha,n}z$.

Hence

$(*)'_{\alpha,n}$ $y^1_{\alpha,0}=(\prod\limits_{\ell<n}d_{\alpha,\ell})y^1_{\alpha,n}+\sum\limits_{n_1<n}(\prod\limits_{\ell=n_1}^{n-1}d_{\alpha,\ell})y^2_{\rho_\alpha\restriction\alpha}+\sum\limits_{n_1<n}\sum\limits_{m<k_*}(\prod\limits_{\ell=n_1}^{n-1}d_{\alpha,\ell})x_{m,\omega\cdot\alpha+n}+\sum\limits_{n_1<n}(\prod\limits_{\ell=n_2}^{n-1}d_\ell)a_{\alpha,n_1}z$.

Now continue as in the proof of part (1). $\square_{2.16}$

We now can put things together

Conclusion 2.18. *1) For every* $\mathbf{k}\ge1$ *there is a* $\aleph_{\omega_1\cdot\mathbf{k}}$*-free Abelian group* G *which is not Whitehead and even* $\mathrm{Hom}(G,\mathbb{Z})=0$.
2) If the ring R *satisfies the demands in clause (c) part (2) from 2.16 then for every* $\mathbf{k}$ *there is an* $\aleph_{\omega_1\cdot\mathbf{k}}$*-free* R*-module such that* $\mathrm{Hom}(G,{}_RR)=0$ *and* $\mathrm{Ext}(g,{}_RR)\ne0$.

Proof. 1) Given $\mathbf{k}$ we use 1.20 to find a c.p. $\mathbf{x}$ which is $\aleph_{\omega_1\cdot\mathbf{k}}$-free and has χ-BB where $\chi=|R|+\aleph_1$ and $J=J^{\rm bd}_{\aleph_0\times\aleph_1}$. Now apply 2.16(1) so $(\aleph_1,J,\mathbf{k})$ fits $\mathbb{Z}$ and by 2.13(1),(2) we get the desired conclusion.
2) Similarly, but now we use 2.16(2) rather than 2.16(1). $\square_{2.18}$

§ 2(B). **Reduced Separable Abelian p-groups and other Classes.**

The results above do not apply directly to the class $\mathbf{K}_p$ of separable reduced Abelian p-groups, as the relevant notion of freeness is different, see on such groups in [Fuc73],[GT12].

Recall that in $\mathbf{K}_p$ we naturally replace "$\mathrm{Hom}(G,K)=0$" by "every $h\in\mathrm{Hom}(G,H)$ is small". We work in a more general frame (2.20), 2.23.

Definition 2.19. Let p be a prime.
1) Let $\mathbf{K}_p$ be the class of Abelian p-group G which are reduced (i.e. have no divisible non-trivial group) and separable (i.e. $\cap\{p^nG : n \geq 1\} = \{0_G\}$).
2) For $G, H \in \mathbf{K}_p$ we say $h \in \mathrm{Hom}(H, G)$ is small when for every $n(1)$ for some $n(2)$ we have $x \in p^{n(2)}H \Rightarrow p^{n(1)}(h(x)) = 0_G$.
3) We say G is $\mathbf{K}_p$-free when G is the direct sum of finite cyclic p-groups.
4) We say G is $(\theta, \mathbf{K}_p)$-free when for every $H \subseteq \theta$ of cardinality $< \theta$ is $\mathbf{K}_p$-free.

More generally

Definition 2.20. 1) We say $\mathbf{m}$ is a module-parameter when it consists of:

- (a) R is a ring
- (b) M^* is a fixed R-module
- (c) $\mathscr{M}$, a set or class of R-modules
- (d) θ is a regular cardinal, the default value is $\aleph_0$

1A) So above $R = R_{\mathbf{m}}$, etc.
2) Let $K^{\rm fr}_{\mathbf{m}}$ be the class of $\mathbf{m}$-free R-modules G which means $G = \oplus\{M_s : s \in I\} \oplus M$ where $M \cong M^*_{\mathbf{m}}$ and each M_s is isomorphic to some member of $\mathscr{M}_{\mathbf{m}}$.
3) Let $K^{\rm sfr}_{\mathbf{m}}$ be defined similarly omitting M.
4) Let $K_{\mathbf{m}}$ be the class of R-modules such that for some θ-directed patial order I and $\langle G_s : s \in I\rangle$ of members of $K^{\rm fr}_{\mathbf{m}}$ such that $s <_I t \Rightarrow M_t$ is θ-free over M_s (see below) we have $G = \cup\{G_s : s \in I\rangle$.
5) For R-modules M_1, M_2 let "M_2 is $(\theta, \mathbf{m})$ free over M_1" means that for every $X \subseteq M_2$ of cardinality $< \theta$ for some $N \in K^{\rm sfr}_{\mathbf{m}}$ we have $M_2 \oplus N \subseteq M_2$ and $X \subseteq M_1 \oplus N$.

Discussion 2.21. We can continue:

- (1) Definition of the construction
- (2) Definition of the fitness
- (3) Proof of $(\aleph_0, \mathbf{k})$-fit
- (4) parallel to "there is non-Whithead"
- (5) by amalgamation over countable $K \in \mathbf{K}_p$ get non-small homomorphisms to a countable (e.g. $\mathbf{K}_p$-free) one.

2) We define $\mathbf{K}^{\rm gr}_{\mathbf{m}}$ similarly to $K^{\rm fr}_{\mathbf{m}}$ expanding G by the individual constants c^G for $c \in M^*$ such that $c \mapsto c^G$ is an embedding of M^* into G. Similarly $\mathbf{K}^{\rm sgr}_{\mathbf{m}}, \mathbf{K}^g_{\mathbf{m}}$ are parallel to $K^{\rm sfr}_{\mathbf{m}}, K_{\mathbf{m}}$.
3) For $M, N \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{m}}$ let $\mathrm{Hom}_R(M, N)$ be the set of homomorphism f from M to N as R-modules, so no restriction of $f(c^M)$; we may say f is an R-homomorphism from M to N.

We now fit the more general context from 2.20, to one presenting the problem below.

Definition 2.22. We say Ξ is an $\mathbf{m}$-problem when:

- (a) $\mathbf{m}$ is a module parameter, so in particular $R = R_{\mathbf{m}}$ is a ring
- (b) Ξ is a set of triples of the form (G, H, h) satisfying

(α) $G \in K_{\mathbf{m}}$
(β) H is an R-module
(γ) h is a homomorphism from G to H.

Definition 2.23. 1) We say that $\mathbf{x}$ does θ-fit $(\chi, \mathbf{m}, \Xi)$ <u>when</u>:

(A) (a) $\mathbf{m}$ is a module-parameter
(b) Ξ is an R-problem
(c) $\mathbf{x}$ is a c.p.
(d) $\mathbf{x}$ has a χ-black box
(e) if $(G_*, H_*, h_*) \in \Xi$ <u>then</u> $|H_*|^{\partial(\ell)} + |G_*| \leq \chi$
(f) Ξ has cardinality $\leq \chi$

(B) for every $(G_*, H_*, h_*) \in \Xi$, if $G_0 = \oplus\{M_{m,i} : m < \mathbf{k}, i < \partial_m\} \oplus M^*_{\mathbf{m}}$ with $M_{m,i} \in K^{\rm sfr}_{\mathbf{m}}$, $\sum\limits_{m,i} \|M_{m,i}\| < \theta$ and $h \in {\rm Hom}_R(G_1, H_*)$ extending h_* <u>then</u> there is G_1 such that:

(*) (α) G_1 is an R-module extending G_0
(β) G_1 has cardinality $< \theta$
(γ) there is no R-homomorphism from G_1 into H_* extending h.

2)-5) Parallely to Definition 2.12.

Claim 2.24. *The parallel of 2.13 for $K_{\mathbf{m}}$.*

Proof. 1),2) As there.
3) Recall $\theta = {\rm cf}(\theta)$ is $> \|G_*\|$ whenever $(G_*, H_*, h_*) \in \Xi$. We choose $M_i \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{m}}$ for $i \leq \theta$, increasing continuous with i.

For $i = 0$ let M_0 be the expansion of $M^*_{\mathbf{m}}$ by $c^{M} = c$ for $c \in M^*$.

For i a limit ordinal let $M_i = \cup\{M_j : j < i\}$.

For $i = j+1$ let $\langle (G_{j,\alpha}, H_{j,\alpha}, h_{j,\alpha}, g_{j,\alpha}, M_{j,\alpha}) : \alpha < \alpha_j \rangle$ list $\mathscr{M}_i = \{(G_*, H_*, h_*, g, M) : M \subseteq_R M_j, g$ and R-isomorphism from M onto G_* and $(G_*, H_*, h_*) \in \Xi\}$.

For each $\alpha < \alpha_j$ let $N_{j,\alpha} \in \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{m}}$ extend $M_{j,\alpha}$ (in $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{m}}$) such that no $h \in {\rm Hom}_R(N_{,\alpha}, H_{j,\alpha})$ extend $h_{j,\alpha} \cdot g_{j,\alpha}$ exist and $N_{j,\alpha}$ is θ-free over $M_{j,\alpha}$ in $\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{m}}$.

Without loss of generality $N_{j,\alpha} \cap M_j = M_{j,\alpha}$ and $\langle N_{j,\alpha} \backslash M_{j,\alpha} : \alpha < \alpha_j \rangle$ are pairwise disjoint and M_i is generated by $\cup\{N_{j,\alpha} : \alpha < \alpha_j\}$ freely except that it extends M_j and $N_{j,\alpha}$ for $\alpha < \alpha_j$. $\square_{2.24}$

How does $\mathbf{K}_p$ fit this frame?

Definition 2.25. 1) For a prime $p, \mathbf{m}_p$ is a module parameter where $\mathbf{m}_p$ consists of:

(a) R is the ring $\mathbb{Z}$, so an R-module is an Abelian group
(b) M^* is the zero R-module
(c) $\mathscr{M} = \{\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z} : n = 1, 2 \ldots\}$
(d) $\theta = \aleph_0$.

2) Ξ_p is the class of triples (G, H, b) such that:

(a) $G \in \mathbf{K}_p$ has cardinality $\leq 2^{\aleph_0}$ is not torsion-complete

(b) $G =$ has the form $\oplus\{G_n : n \in \mathscr{U}\}$ where $\mathscr{U} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is infinite and $G_n \cong \mathbb{Z}/p^n Z$

(c) h is a non-small homomorphism from G to H.

Claim 2.26. *1) The classes $\mathbf{K}_p, K_{\mathbf{m}_p}$ are equal.*
2) Ξ_p is an R-problem.

Proof. Easy. $\square_{2.26}$

Claim 2.27. *The parallel of 2.16 holds.*

Proof. Straight. $\square$

Conclusion 2.28. *The parallel of 2.18 holds.*

Conclusion 2.29. *For every $\mathbf{k} \geq 1$ and χ there is $G \in \mathbf{K}_p$ such that:*

(a) *if $H \in \mathbf{K}_p$ has no torsion complete subgroups and $\|H\| \leq \chi$ then every $h \in \mathrm{Hom}(G, H)$ is small, see Definition 2.19(2)*
(b) *G is $\aleph_{\omega_1 \cdot \mathbf{k}}$-free in the sense of $\mathbf{K}_p$.*

§ 3. Forcing Variations of [Sh:1028, §3]

§ 3(A). The Main Independence Result.

Convention 3.1. Groups here mean Abelian groups[8]

We like to prove that Conclusion 2.18(1) is optimal, see 3.2.

Below, it is reasonable to assume that the ring R is $\mathbb{Z}$ and we assume this is the nice version. Note that we prove that a non-Whitehead group has a non-free subgroup of small cardinality, not necessarily a non-Whitehead one. This is connected to the black boxes having cardinality (much) bigger than the amount of freedom. For simplicity, presently we deal with freeness only in hereditary cases.

Theorem 3.2. *If in* $\mathbf{V}$ *there is a supercompact cardinal* <u>then</u> *in some forcing extension we have for* $\mu_* = \aleph_{\omega_1 \cdot \omega}$*:*

$\oplus_{\mu_*}$ (a) *if* G *is a non-free* μ_**-free Abelian group* <u>then</u> $\mathrm{Hom}(G,\mathbb{Z}) \neq 0$,

(b) *if* $G \subseteq H$ *are Abelian groups and* H/G *is* μ_**-free and* $h \in \mathrm{Hom}(G,\mathbb{Z})$ <u>then</u> h *can be extended to a homomorphism from* H *to* $\mathbb{Z}$*, (this is an equivalent definition of "*H/G *is Whitehead" the reader may use it here as a definition).*

Definition 3.3. Let $\mathrm{Pr}_{\lambda_*,\mu_*,\kappa_*}$ means[9]

(A) (a) $\lambda_* > \mu_* > \kappa_*$

(b) λ_*, κ_* are regular uncountable

(c) μ_* is a limit cardinal

(B) if (a) then (b) where

$(a)(\alpha)$ λ is a regular cardinal $\geq \lambda_*$

(β) $\chi > \lambda$ and $\mu < \mu_*$ and $x \in \mathscr{H}(\chi)$

(γ) $S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) < \kappa_*\}$ is a stationary subset of λ

(δ) $u_\alpha \in [\alpha]^{\leq \mu}$ for $\alpha \in S$

(b) there are a regular $\lambda' \in (\mu + \kappa_*, \mu_*)$ and an increasing continuous sequence $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda' \rangle$ of ordinals $< \lambda$ such that the set $\{\varepsilon < \lambda' : \alpha_\varepsilon \in S \text{ and } u_{\alpha_\varepsilon} \subseteq \{\alpha_\zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\}\}$ is a stationary subset of λ'.

Fact 3.4. 1) The universe constructed in [MgSh:204] satisfies $\mathrm{Pr}_{\lambda_*,\mu_*,\kappa_*}$ <u>when</u> $\lambda_* = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda_*) \geq \mu_* = \aleph_{\omega_1 \cdot \omega}$ and $\kappa_* = \aleph_2$.

1A) The $\mathbf{V}$ above satisfies also G.C.H., and without loss of generality $\diamondsuit^*_\lambda$ for every regular uncountable λ.

2) If $\mathrm{Pr}_{\lambda_*,\mu_*,\kappa_*}$ holds in $\mathbf{V}$ and the c.c.c. forcing $\mathbb{P}$ has cardinality λ_* <u>then</u> in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$ still $\mathrm{Pr}_{\lambda_*,\mu_*,\kappa_*}$ holds.

Proof. 1), 1A) By [MgSh:204].

2) Easy. $\square_{3.4}$

[8] This is justified by 3.12(B)(e).

[9] May allow $\lambda_* = \mu_*$ here and in 3.5 but then have to say somewhat more.

Proof. Proof of 3.2

Use 3.4 letting $\mathbb{P}$ be a c.c.c. forcing notion of cardinality λ_* such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "MA + $2^{\aleph_0} = \lambda_*$". The result follows from Theorem 3.5 below. Clause (d) there holds if $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_0^{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbf{V}_0$ as in [MgSh:204], see 3.4(2) where $\mathbb{P}$ is a c.c.c. forcing notion of cardinality λ_* such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_*}$ "MA + $2^{\aleph_0} = \lambda_*$". $\square_{3.2}$

Theorem 3.5. *The statement $\oplus_{\mu_*}$ from 3.2 holds when $\mathbf{V}$ satisfies:*

- (a) *the statements $\Pr_{\lambda_*,\mu_*,\kappa_*}$ from Definition 3.3*
- (b) $\lambda_* = \mu_*^+ \wedge \mu_* > \mathrm{cf}(\mu_*)$
- (c) $\kappa_* = \aleph_2$
- (d) $\mathrm{MA} + 2^{\aleph_0} = \lambda_*$ *and* $\mathbf{V}$ *satisfies the strong hypothesis.*

Proof. We rely on 3.6 - 3.12 below. First clause (b) of $\oplus_{\mu_*}$ implies clause (a), because if H is a μ_*-free Abelian group, let $x \in H \backslash \{0_H\}$ and without loss of generality x is not divisible by any $n \in \{2,3,\ldots\}$ hence $K := \mathbb{Z}x$ is a pure subgroup of H, let h be an isomorphism from K onto $\mathbb{Z}$, hence by $\oplus_{\mu_*}(b)$ there is a homomorphism h^+ from H to $\mathbb{Z}$ extending h so $h^+(x) \neq 0_{\mathbb{Z}}$ hence $h^+ \in \mathrm{Hom}(H,\mathbb{Z})$ is non-zero, as required.

So it suffices to prove clause (b) of $\oplus_{\mu_*}$.

Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$ and let $\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{K}_*$ be as in 3.8 below for λ_* so $\mathbf{K}_*$ is a hereditary $(\mu_*, \aleph_2)$-freeness class (see 3.7(1),(1A),(4)) by 3.8(1). So toward contradiction assume $G \in \mathbf{K}$ is a counterexample of minimal cardinality called μ so G is μ_*-free and $G_1 \subseteq_{\mathrm{pr}} G_2, G_2/G_1 \cong G$ and $h_1 \in \mathrm{Hom}(G_1,\mathbb{Z})$ and we should prove that there is $h_2 \in \mathrm{Hom}(G_2,\mathbb{Z})$ extending h_1. If G is $\mathbf{K}_*$-free (see 3.7(2)) then by 3.8(3) a homomorphism h_2 as required exists.

Hence G is not $\mathbf{K}_*$-free (see 3.7(2)) then let $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{K}_*,G,\kappa}$, see Definition 3.9 and by 3.11 (with μ, λ_*, κ_* here standing for μ, λ, κ there) there is a witness $\mathbf{s}$ as there.

Let $\mathbf{c}_1 = \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{N}_{\mathrm{nf}},G_\alpha}$, again a $(\lambda, \aleph_1)$-freeness context.

Let $S_1 = W(<>, S_{\mathbf{s}})$ so for each $\delta \in S_1, B^{\mathbf{s}}_{<\delta+1>}/B^{\mathbf{s}}_{<\delta>}$ cannot be μ_*-free for $\mathbf{c}$ (as we have chosen a counter-example of minimal cardinality) hence there is $A_\delta \subseteq B^{\mathbf{s}}_{<\delta+1>}$ of cardinality $< \mu_*$ such that $A_\delta/B^{\mathbf{s}}_{<\delta>}$ is not free (i.e. not $\mathbf{c}_1$-free!).

Let $B'_\delta \subseteq B^{\mathbf{s}}_{<\delta>}$ be of cardinality $\leq |A_\delta| + \kappa_*$ such that $B'_\delta \subseteq B' \subseteq B^{\mathbf{s}}_{<\delta>} \Rightarrow A_\delta/B'$ is not free for $\mathbf{c}_1$; exist by properties of modules - see 3.10(f).

So for some $\mu < \mu_*$ the set $S_2 = \{\delta \in S_1 : |A_\delta \cup B'_\delta| + \kappa_* = \mu\}$ is a stationary subset of $\lambda(\langle\rangle, S_{\mathbf{s}})$. Let h be a one-to-one function from $\lambda(\langle\rangle, S_{\mathbf{s}})$ onto $B^{\mathbf{s}}_{<\lambda>}$ and let $C := \{\delta < \lambda(\langle\rangle, S_{\mathbf{s}}) : h \text{ maps } \delta \text{ onto } B^{\mathbf{s}}_\delta\}$, it is a club of $\lambda(\langle\rangle, S_{\mathbf{s}})$ hence $S_3 := S_2 \cap C$ is a stationary subset of $\lambda(\langle\rangle, S_{\mathbf{s}})$. Also for $\delta \in S_3$ let $u_\delta = \{\alpha < \delta : h(\alpha) \in B'_\delta\}$.

By clause (c) of 3.11, i.e. the choice of $\mathbf{s}$, without loss of generality one of the following occurs:

- (a) $\delta \in S_3 \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa_1$ for some regular $\kappa_1 < \kappa_*$
- (b) every $\delta \in S_3$ has cofinality $\geq \lambda$.

Case 1: $\kappa_1 < \kappa_*$ is as in clause (a)

Just use $\Pr_{\lambda_*,\mu_*,\kappa_*}$ for $\lambda, S_3, \langle u_\delta : \delta \in S_3\rangle$ to prove G is not μ_*-free continuous.

Case 2: Clause (b) above holds

For $\delta \in S_3$ clearly $|u_\delta| = |A_\delta \cup B'_\delta| + \kappa_* = \mu < \mu_* \leq \lambda \leq \mathrm{cf}(\delta)$ hence there is $\gamma_\delta < \delta$ be such that $u_\delta \subseteq \gamma_\delta$ hence for some $\gamma_* < \lambda$ the set $S_4 = \{\delta \in S_3 : u_\delta \subseteq \gamma_*\}$ is stationary.

Subcase 2A: $\mathrm{cf}([\gamma_*]^{\le\mu},\subseteq)$ is $<\lambda$

So for some $u_*\in[\gamma_*]^{\le\mu}$ the set $S_5=\{\delta<\lambda:u_\delta\subseteq u_*\}$ is a stationary subset of λ. Let $S_6\subseteq S_5$ be of cardinality μ^+ and let $A^*=\cup\{A_\delta:\delta\in S_6\}\cup\{h(\alpha):\alpha\in u_*\}$. Clearly $A^*\subseteq G$ is of cardinality $<\mu$ and $A^*/\emptyset$ is not free for $\mathbf{c}_1$.

So G has a non-free subgroup of cardinality $<\mu_*$, contradiction to the assumption "$G=G_2/G_1$ is μ_*-free".

Subcase 2B: $\mathrm{cf}([\gamma_*]^{\le\mu},\subseteq)\ge\lambda$

Note that if $\mathbf{V}$ satisfies the strong hypothesis, necessarily for some cardinal ∂ of cofinality $<\kappa_*$ we have $\lambda(\langle\rangle,S_{\mathbf{s}})=\partial^+$.

In any case clearly for every $\alpha\in[\gamma_*,\lambda)$, letting $\beta_\alpha=\min(S_5\backslash\alpha)$, the pair $A_{\beta_\alpha}/B_{<\alpha>}$ is not $\mathbf{c}_1$-free. So renaming without loss of generality $\alpha\ge\gamma_*\wedge\mathrm{cf}(\alpha)=\aleph_0\Rightarrow\langle\alpha\rangle\in S$ and we continue as in Case 1, so this works also in Subcase 2A. $\square_{3.5}$

§ 3(B). **Freeness Classes.**

Context 3.6. 1) R is a ring with no zero divisors.
2) $\mathbf{K}$ is the class of R-rings.
3) $\mathbf{K}_*$ will denote a class $\subseteq\mathbf{K}$.

Definition 3.7. 0) $\mathbf{K}^w=\{M\in\mathbf{K}:M$ a Whitehead module that is, $\mathrm{Ext}(M,{}_RR)=0\}$ equivalently, if $N_1\subseteq N_2$ are R-modules, $N_2/N_1\cong N$ and $h_1\in\mathrm{Hom}(N_1,{}_RR)$ then there is $h_2\in\mathrm{Hom}(N_2,{}_RR)$ extending h_1.
1) We say $\mathbf{K}_*$ is a λ-freeness class inside $\mathbf{K}$ when:

(a) $\mathbf{K}_*\subseteq\mathbf{K}_{<\lambda}$ where for any cardinality θ we let $\mathbf{K}_{<\theta}:=\{M\in\mathbf{K}:\|M\|<\theta\}$

(b) $\mathbf{K}_*$ is closed under isomorphisms

(c) for simplicity $(\forall\theta<\mu)(\exists M\in\mathbf{K}_*)(\|M\|\ge\theta)$ and $\lambda>|R|$.

1A) We say $\mathbf{K}_*$ is hereditary when $\mathbf{K}_*$ is closed under pure submodules, i.e. $M\subseteq_{\mathrm{pr}}N\in\mathbf{K}_*\Rightarrow M\in\mathbf{K}_*$.
2) We say $M\in\mathbf{K}$ is $\mathbf{K}_*$-free when there is $\bar M$ such that $\bar M=\langle M_\alpha:\alpha\le\alpha_*\rangle$ is increasing continuous, M_0 is the zero module and $\alpha<\alpha_*\Rightarrow M_{\alpha+1}/M_\alpha\in\mathbf{K}_*$ and $M_{\alpha_*}=M$.
2A) $M\in\mathbf{K}$ is $(\lambda,\mathbf{K}_*)$-free when every $M'\subseteq_{\mathrm{pr}}M$ of cardinality $<\lambda$ is $\mathbf{K}_*$-free.
3) $\mathbf{K}^*_{<\theta}=\mathbf{K}_*\cap\mathbf{K}_{<\theta}$ for any cardinal θ.
4) The class $\mathbf{K}_*$ is called a (λ,κ)-freeness class when: $\mathbf{K}_*$ is a λ-freeness class, $\mathbf{K}_*$ is hereditary and if $M\in\mathbf{K}_{<\lambda}\backslash\mathbf{K}_*$ then there is $N\subseteq_{\mathrm{pr}}M$ from $\mathbf{K}_{<\kappa}\backslash\mathbf{K}_*$.

The main example is:

Claim 3.8. *Assume $R=\mathbb{Z},\lambda\ge\aleph_1$ and $\mathbf{K}=$ the class of R-modules and let $\mathbf{K}_{whu}=\mathbf{K}_*=\{M\in\mathbf{K}_{<\lambda}:M$ is a Whitehead module, equivalently satisfies condition $\oplus(b)$ of 3.2$\}$ and $\mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{fr}}=\{M\in\mathbf{K}_{<\aleph_1}:M$ free$\}$.*
0) $\mathbf{K}_{\mathrm{fr}}$ is a hereditary $\aleph_1$-freeness class.
1) If $\lambda>\aleph_2$ and $\mathrm{MA}_{<\lambda}$ then $\mathbf{K}_*$ is a hereditary $(\lambda,\aleph_2)$-freeness class.
2) If $M\in\mathbf{K}$ is $\mathbf{K}_*$-free then M is a Whitehead group.
3) If $M_1\subseteq_{\mathrm{pr}}M_2$ and M_2/M_1 is $\mathbf{K}_*$-free and $h_1\in\mathrm{Hom}(M_1,{}_RR)$ then there is $h_2\in\mathrm{Hom}(M_2,{}_RR)$ extending h_1.

4) If $\mathbf{K}_* = \{M \in K_{<\lambda}$*: for every c.c.c. forcing* $\mathbb{P}_1$ *for some c.c.c. forcing notion* $\mathbb{P}_2$ *satisfying* $\mathbb{P}_1 \lessdot \mathbb{P}_2$ *we have* $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_2}$ *"*M *is a Whitehead group"*$\}$ *then* $\mathbf{K}_*$ *is* $(\lambda, \aleph_2)$*-freeness class.*

Proof. 0) Obvious.
1) The first property in 3.7(4) holds trivially by the choice of $\mathbf{K}_*$. As for the second property it is well known that $\mathbf{K}_*$ is a hereditary class, see [Fuc73]. The third property in 3.7(4) follows from the full characterization of being Whitehead for Abelian group G of cardinality $< \lambda$ when $\mathrm{MA}_{<\lambda}$ holds, (not just proving "strongly $\aleph_1$-free is enough"); in particular G is Whitehead if every subgroup of cardinality $\leq \aleph_1$ is Whitehead; see [EM02].
2) Follows by (3).
3) Easy, but we elaborate. Let $M = M_2/M_1$ and $\pi \in \mathrm{Hom}(M_2, M)$ be onto with kernel M. Let $\langle M'_\alpha : \alpha \leq \alpha_* \rangle$ be as in 3.7(4) for M and let $N_\alpha = \pi^{-1}(M'_\alpha)$ so $\langle N_\alpha : \alpha \leq \alpha_* \rangle$ is increasing continuously $N_0^* = M_1, N_{\alpha_*} = M_2$ and $N_{\alpha+1}/N_\alpha \in \mathbf{K}_*$.

Given $h_1 \in \mathrm{Hom}(M_1, {}_R R)$ we choose $f_\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}(N_\alpha, {}_R R)$ increasing continuous with α. For $\alpha = 0$ let $f_\alpha = h_1$, for α limit let $f_\alpha = \cup\{f_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ and for $\alpha = \beta + 1$ use $N_\alpha/N_\beta \cong M'_\alpha/M'_\beta \in \mathbf{K}_*$ and the choice of $\mathbf{K}_*$.

Lastly, $h_2 = f_{\alpha_*}$ is as required.
4) Easy, too. $\square_{3.8}$

Now on those freeness contexts see [Sh:52] or better [Sh:266] and history there.

Definition 3.9. 1) For a freeness class $\mathbf{K}_*$ and R-module G and $\chi \geq |R| + \aleph_0$ (if equal we may omitted) we define what we call a pre-freeness context $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}_G = \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{K}_*, G, \chi}$, (this is proved in 3.10) as the triple $(U, \mathscr{F}, \chi) = (U_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathscr{F}_{\mathbf{c}}, \chi_{\mathbf{c}})$ where:

- (a) $U = G$ as a set
- (b) $\mathscr{F} = \{A/B : B, A \subseteq \mathscr{U}$ and $\langle A \cup B \rangle_G / \langle B \rangle_G$ is $\mathbf{K}_*$-free$\}$, we may say A/B is $\mathbf{c}$-free so A/B stands for the formal quotient, so pedantically is just the pair (A, B); where $\langle B \rangle_G$ is the minimal pure sub-module of G which includes B
- (c) $\chi_{\mathbf{c}} = \chi$ so $\geq |R| + \aleph_0$, so (and $\mu_{\mathbf{c}} = \infty$) so omitted.

2) We say $\mathbf{c}$ is a (λ, κ)-freeness context when: in addition $\chi_{\mathbf{c}} \leq \kappa$ and if A/B is not $\mathbf{c}$-free and $|A| < \lambda$ then for some $A' \subseteq A$ of cardinality $< \kappa$, A'/B is not $\mathbf{c}$-free.

Fact 3.10. Assume $\mathbf{K}_*$ is a λ-freeness class.
1) Being $\mathbf{K}_*$-free has compactness in singular cardinals $> \lambda$.
2) For any R-module G_*, the following freeness context $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{K}_*, G_*}, \chi$ defined in 3.9 above satisfies AxI^{**}, II, III, IV, VI, VII (see [Sh:266]).
3) If $\mathbf{K}_*$ is moreover a (λ, κ)-freeness class then $\mathbf{c}$ is a (λ, κ)-freeness context.

Proof. 1) By part (2) and [Sh:266], see history there.
2) Check.
3) Easy.
4) If A/B is not free (for $\mathbf{c}$, so $A, B \subseteq G_*$), then for some $B' \subseteq B, |B'| \leq |A| + |R|$ and for every B'' we have $B' \subseteq B'' \subseteq B \Rightarrow A/B''$ is not free. $\square_{3.10}$

Claim 3.11. *If (A) then (B) where:*

- (A) (a) $\mathbf{K}_*$ *is a* (λ, κ)*-freeness class, see Definition 3.7(4)*

- (b) $G \in \mathbf{K}_*$ *is* $(\mathbf{K}_*, \lambda)$*-free not free, see Definition 3.7(2A); fix such* M *of minimal cardinality called* μ
- (c) $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{K}_*, G, \kappa}$, *see Definition 3.9(1)*

(B) *there is a witness* $\mathbf{s}$ *for* M *in the context* $\mathbf{c}$ *(see* [Sh:161] *and* [Sh:521, §3]*) such that:*

- (a) $B^{\mathbf{s}}_{<>} = \emptyset, B^{\mathbf{s}}_{<>^+} \subseteq G$ *so* $\lambda(<>, S_{\mathbf{s}}) \leq \|M\|$
- (b) *if* $\eta \notin \mathrm{fin}(S_{\mathbf{s}})$ *then* $\lambda_{\mathbf{s},\eta} \geq \lambda$
- (c) *if* $\eta^\frown\langle\delta\rangle \in S_{\mathbf{s}}$ *then* $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) \notin [\kappa, \lambda)$
- (d) *if* $\eta \in \mathrm{fin}(S_{\mathbf{s}})$ *then* $B_{\mathbf{s},\eta^+} \backslash B_{\mathbf{s},\eta}$ *has cardinality* $< \kappa$

Proof. By 3.10 we can apply 3.12. $\square_{3.11}$

Claim 3.12. *If (A) then (B) where*

(A) (a) $\mathbf{c}$ *is a freeness contexts satisfying* $\mathrm{Ax}I^{**}, II, III, IV, VI, VII$

- (b) $\mathbf{c}$ *is* (λ, κ)*-freeness context*
- (c) A/B *is* λ*-free not free pair; and with* $|A|$ *minimal*

(B) *there is a witness* $\mathbf{s}$ *such that*

- (a) $B^{\mathbf{s}}_{<>} = B$ *and* $B^{\mathbf{s}}_{<>^+} \subseteq A$ *so* $\lambda(<>, S_{\mathbf{s}}) \leq |A|$ *but* $\geq \lambda$
- (b) *if* $\eta \notin \mathrm{fin}(S_{\mathbf{s}})$ *then* $\lambda_{\mathbf{s},\eta} \geq \lambda$
- (c) *if* $\eta^\frown\langle\delta\rangle \in S_{\mathbf{s}}$ *then* $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) \notin [\kappa, \lambda)$
- (d) *if* $\eta \in \mathrm{fin}(S_{\mathbf{s}})$ *then* $B_{\mathbf{s},\eta^+} \backslash B_{\mathbf{s},\eta}$ *has cardinality* $< \kappa$.

Proof. Now (see [Sh:521, §3] or better yet see [Sh:F13, 4.5=Ld15], there is a disjoint witness $\mathbf{s}$ for A/B being non-$\mathbf{c}$-free. So without loss of generality ($n = n(\mathbf{s})$ is well defined and) for some $\bar{\lambda}^* = \langle \lambda^*_\ell : \ell < n\rangle, \bar{\kappa}^* = \langle \kappa^*_\ell : \ell < n\rangle$ we have

$(*)_1$ (a) for each $\ell < n, \lambda_\ell$ is a regular cardinal and $\eta \in S_{\mathbf{s},\ell} \Rightarrow \lambda(\eta, S_{\mathbf{s}}) = \lambda^*_\ell$ (or $\lambda_\ell = *$ and $\eta \in S_{\mathbf{s},\ell} \Rightarrow \lambda(\eta, S_{\mathbf{s}})$ is (possibly weakly) inaccessible),

- (b) if for each $\ell < n$, either κ_ℓ is a regular cardinal and $\eta \in S_{\mathbf{s},\ell} \wedge \delta \in W(\eta, S_{\mathbf{s}}) \Rightarrow \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa_\ell$ [or $\kappa_\ell = *$ and $\lambda_{\ell+2}$ is $*$].

See more there; naturally

$(*)_2$ $\mathbf{s}$ is minimal as there or just

- (a) n is minimal
- (b) under (a), $\bar{\lambda}^*$ is minimal under the lexicographical order
- (c) under (a) + (b), $\bar{\kappa}^*$ is minimal under the lexicopgrahical order.

Now

$(*)_3$ if $\eta \in \mathrm{ini}(S_{\mathbf{s}})$ then $\lambda(\eta, S_{\mathbf{s}}) \geq \lambda$.

[Why? Otherwise chose a counterexample η with $\lambda(\eta, S_{\mathbf{s}})$ minimal so by the definition of a witness as $\chi_{\mathbf{c}} \leq \kappa$ we have $B^{\mathbf{s}}_{\eta^+}/B^{\mathbf{s}}_{\leq\eta}$ is not free $B^{\mathbf{s}}_{\eta^+} \backslash B^{\mathbf{s}}_\eta$ has cardinality $\lambda(\eta, S_{\mathbf{s}})$ so $< \lambda$ and $\alpha < \lambda(\eta, S_{\mathbf{s}}) \Rightarrow B^{\mathbf{s}}_{\eta^\frown<\alpha=1>} \backslash B^{\mathbf{s}}_{\eta^\frown<\alpha>}$ has cardinality $< \kappa$. Recalling "$\mathbf{c}$ is a (λ, κ)-freeness context", see Definition 3.9(2), there is $C_\eta \subseteq B^{\mathbf{s}}_{\eta^+}$ of

cardinality $\leq \kappa$ such that $C_\eta/B^{\mathbf{s}}_{\leq \eta}$ is not $\mathbf{c}$-free. So (follows by minimality of $\mathbf{s}$) we get contradiction, so $\lambda(\eta, S_{\mathbf{s}}) \geq \lambda$ as promised in $(*)_3$.]

$(*)_4$ if $\eta^\frown\langle\delta\rangle \in S_{\mathbf{s}}$ then $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) \notin [\kappa, \lambda)$.

[Why? As in the proof there for each $\eta \in S_{\mathbf{s}}$ by the minimality, $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) \in \{\lambda(\nu, S_{\mathbf{s}}) : \nu \in S_{\mathbf{s}} \text{ satisfies } \eta \lhd \nu\}$, so $(*)_4$ follows by $(*)_3$.]

So we are done. $\square_{3.12}$

References

[CG85] A. L. S. Corner and Rüdiger Göbel, *Prescribing endomorphism algebras, a unified treatment*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society. Third Series **50** (1985), 447–479.

[EM02] Paul C. Eklof and Alan Mekler, *Almost free modules: Set theoretic methods*, North–Holland Mathematical Library, vol. 65, North–Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 2002, Revised Edition.

[Fuc73] Laszlo Fuchs, *Infinite Abelian Groups*, vol. I, II, Academic Press, New York, 1970, 1973.

[GT12] Rüdiger Göbel and Jan Trlifaj, *Approximations and endomorphism algebras of modules, vol. i, ii*, de Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics, Walter de Gruyter, 2012.

[Sh:a] Saharon Shelah, *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 92, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, xvi+544 pp, $62.25, 1978.

[Sh:c] ———, *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, vol. 92, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, xxxiv+705 pp, 1990.

[Sh:g] ———, *Cardinal Arithmetic*, Oxford Logic Guides, vol. 29, Oxford University Press, 1994.

[Sh:F13] S. Shelah, *Compactness spectrum*.

[Sh:51] Saharon Shelah, *Why there are many nonisomorphic models for unsuperstable theories*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (Vancouver, B. C., 1974), vol. 1, Canad. Math. Congress, Montreal, Que, 1974, pp. 259–263.

[Sh:52] ———, *A compactness theorem for singular cardinals, free algebras, Whitehead problem and transversals*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **21** (1975), 319–349.

[Sh:54] ———, *The lazy model-theoretician's guide to stability*, Logique et Analyse **18** (1975), 241–308.

[Sh:98] ———, *Whitehead groups may not be free, even assuming CH. II*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **35** (1980), 257–285.

[Sh:161] ———, *Incompactness in regular cardinals*, Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic **26** (1985), 195–228.

[Sh:172] ———, *A combinatorial principle and endomorphism rings. I. On p-groups*, Israel Journal of Mathematics **49** (1984), 239–257, Proceedings of the 1980/1 Jerusalem Model Theory year.

[MgSh:204] Menachem Magidor and Saharon Shelah, *When does almost free imply free? (For groups, transversal etc.)*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society **7** (1994), no. 4, 769–830.

[Sh:227] Saharon Shelah, *A combinatorial theorem and endomorphism rings of abelian groups. II*, Abelian groups and modules (Udine, 1984), CISM Courses and Lectures, vol. 287, Springer, Vienna, 1984, Proceedings of the Conference on Abelian Groups, Undine, April 9-14, 1984); ed. Goebel, R., Metelli, C., Orsatti, A. and Solce, L., pp. 37–86.

[Sh:266] ———, *Compactness in singular cardinals revisited*, , math.LO/1401.3175.

[Sh:309] ———, *Black Boxes*, , 0812.0656. 0812.0656. 0812.0656.

[Sh:521] ———, *If there is an exactly λ-free abelian group then there is an exactly λ-separable one*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **61** (1996), 1261–1278, math.LO/9503226.

[Sh:775] ———, *Middle Diamond*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **44** (2005), 527–560, math.LO/0212249.

[Sh:883] ———, *$\aleph_n$-free abelain group with no non-zero homomorphism to $\mathbb{Z}$*, CUBO, A Mathematical Journal **9** (2007), 59–79, math.LO/0609634.

[Sh:897] ———, *Theories with EF-Equivalent Non-Isomorphic Models*, Tbilisi Mathematical Journal **1** (2008), 133–164, math.LO/0703477.

[Sh:898] ———, *PCF and abelian groups*, Forum Mathematicum **25** (2013), 967–1038, 0710.0157.

[Sh:F918] ———, *Theories with EF-Equivalent Non-Isomorphic Models II*.

[GbSh:920] Ruediger Goebel and Saharon Shelah, *$\aleph_n$-free modules with trivial dual*, Results in Mathematics **54** (2009), 53–64.

[GbHeSh:970] Ruediger Goebel, Daniel Herden, and Saharon Shelah, *Prescribing endomorphism rings of $\aleph_n$-free modules*, Journal of the European Mathematical Society **accepted**.

[GbShSm:981] Rudiger Goebel, Saharon Shelah, and Lutz Struengmann, *$\aleph_n$-free Modules over complete discrete valuation domains with small dual*, Glasgow Mathematical Journal **55** (2013), 369–380.

[Sh:1005] Saharon Shelah, *PCF with narrow choice or ZF + DC + AX_4*, Archive for Mathematical Logic **submitted**.
[Sh:1006] ———, *On incompactness for chromatic number of graphs*, Acta Mathematica Hungarica **139(4)** (2013), 363–371, math.LO/1205.0064.
[Sh:1008] ———, *Non-reflection of the bad set for $\check{I}_\theta[\lambda]$ and pcf*, Acta Mathematica Hungarica **141** (2013), 11–35, 1206.2048.
[Sh:1028] ———, *Quite free complicated abelian group, pcf and bb*, preprint.
[Sh:1045] ———, *Quite free Abelian groups with prescribed endomorphism ring*, preprint.
[Sh:F1303] ———, *Set theory with weak choice: Ax_4 and Abelian groups*.

Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 91904, Israel, and, Department of Mathematics, Hill Center - Busch Campus, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 110 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

E-mail address: shelah@math.huji.ac.il
URL: http://shelah.logic.at